Vol. XV.] [No. 1.

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF THE CHRISTIAN THOUGHT AND LIFE SET FORTH FROM THE SCRIPTURES BY EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

JANUARY, 1908.

The Duty of the New Church in Relation to the Moral, Political, and Economic Life of the Community. JOB BARNARD . . . 1

Primeval Man. T. K. PAYTON 7

The Seven Churches — Philadelphia and Laodicea. JOHN GODDARD 26

The Biblical and Babylonian Versions of Creation. ADOLPH L. GOERWITZ 39

The Relation of the Church to Civil Affairs. JAMES REED . . . 53

Mental Healing. H. CLINTON HAY 64

Some Aspects of Mental Healing. HERBERT C. SMALL 75

The Divine Name. JACOB E. WERREN 86

Idle Words: Matthew xii. 34-37. J. B. KEENE 98

The Virgin Birth of the Lord. [A Review of "The Virgin Birth of Christ," by James Orr, M. A., D.D.] H. CLINTON HAY 107

Editorial Department: 114

Theodore Francis Wright; Churches as Social Clubs; The Fourth Gospel as History; What is Needed Most of All; "Who is the Christian Deity?" True Worship; Missionary Work in the New Church.

Biblical and Doctrinal Studies: 131

Psalm xx. 3, in "Arcana," 923, and other passages; A Relation Modified in Restatement; "Arcana," 10610, Omitted; The Fourteenth Chapter of Matthew.

Current Literature: 143

Rodgers' New Theology Problems; Rodgers' Swedenborg: the Philosopher and Theologian; Beckwith's Realities of Christian Theology; Symons' William Blake; Burrows' Discoveries in Crete; Papers and Proceedings of the Fourth Convention of Religious Education Association, Rochester, N. Y., Feb., 1907; Benson's Memoirs of Arthur Hamilton; Hall's Aunt Jane of Kentucky; Harvard Divinity School Addresses: The Ministry as a Profession; Harnack's New Testament Studies: I. Luke the Physician.

BOSTON:

THE MASSACHUSETTS NEW-CHURCH UNION,

16 ARLINGTON STREET.

50 CENTS A COPY. $2.00 A YEAR

Entered at the Post-Office at Boston as Second Class Matter

HOUGHTON LIBRARY PACIFIC SCHOOL

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW.

Fourteen years ago the NEW-CHURCH REVIEW was established as the successor of the *New-Jerusalem Magazine*, in the belief that the change of form, allowing as it does for longer articles and for a greater variety of contents, would be of advantage in attempting to cover the field which the earlier publication had so long occupied. That field, as is well known, is the one brought to view in the theological writings of Emanuel Swedenborg, which, being founded on the Holy Scriptures, contain, as we believe, the vital principles of a new dispensation of Christian faith and life, and promise, so far as they shall be received by men, to accomplish the fulfilment of prophecy in establishing the Lord's kingdom on earth.

The REVIEW has sought to give expression to these principles, and to bring their light to bear upon all subjects and events which may be affected by them, whether in the organized Church of the New Jerusalem, in the religious bodies around us, or in the world at large.

The Board of Editors now consists of the Rev. Theodore F. Wright, Ph.D., as managing editor, and of the Rev. Messrs. William H. Mayhew and H. Clinton Hay; with the Rev. Messrs. James Reed and Samuel M. Warren as Advisory Committee. The efforts of the editors have been cordially and generously seconded by other writers in this country and abroad, and the result has been such as to call out many expressions of approval both within and without the special lines of the REVIEW's activity.

A literary critic says: "This publication does the New-Church clergy and laity great credit;" another says: "The NEW-CHURCH REVIEW is a quarterly journal which should prove vastly interesting and instructive to any reader, whatever his or her faith;" another speaks of the "candor and ability" of our articles; and a fourth declares that "it is filled with the sweet liberality of this generous faith."

In entering upon its fifteenth year the REVIEW asks for the continued and increased support of those whose cause it serves, in order that it may be yet more useful in the future.

$2.00 A YEAR. SINGLE NUMBERS 50 CENTS.

The Massachusetts New-Church Union, 16 Arlington Street, Boston.

THE

NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

VOL. XV.] JANUARY, 1908. [No. 1.

THE DUTY OF THE NEW CHURCH IN RELATION TO THE MORAL, POLITICAL, AND ECONOMIC LIFE OF THE COMMUNITY.*

WHAT shall be understood by the words, the New Church? Some may suppose these words, used in this connection, to mean the church in the individual man; but a little reflection will probably lead to the conclusion that the words are intended to apply to the New Church as an organization, either to a single society of the New Church, as a representative of all, or to the whole organized church as an aggregation of societies; and to refer to a question of policy in the conduct of such organization. With that idea, the question might be stated thus: What duty rests upon the New Church as an organized body, in respect to the moral, political, and economic life of the world in which it is?

If the church has a positive duty in this respect, how is this duty to be performed? Is it in duty bound to undertake directly the specific work of regulating the civil, social, and material affairs of men?

Has not the church as such a well-defined field in which to labor, without entering upon the task of teaching political science or sociology or political economy? If it has, can it

* Delivered at a meeting of the Maine Association.

enter upon this less spiritual labor without weakening its influence for good in the community?

What is the purpose of a church society? For what reason does it exist?

Is it not for the purpose of performing the distinctive functions of the heart and lungs for the whole community?

Every government is in the human form and must have its different departments: those that teach, those that make laws, those that execute the laws, those that construe the laws and settle disputes, those that carry the mails, collect the taxes and duties, pay the expenses of administration, and those that supervise elections, etc. They are the head, the eyes, the legs, the hands and arms of the man.

For every definite duty of this external character there is some distinct provision made by the state. Its various departments work together just as the various members of the human body do to carry out the purposes of the whole body. There must be something in this corporate body that gives it life and keeps it moving; something that corresponds to the heart and lungs in man; something that works unobserved, of its own apparent will, day and night, to keep the other members of the body supplied with life and power. The state as such has no church. It cannot create a church. The divine providence of the Lord has created it by the voluntary action of individuals, and for a specific purpose.

It may be said that the church is the conscience of the whole community, and the life of the community must be squared by it. It will be seen to be the most important duty of the church, therefore, to keep its distinctive work in view, for by that policy alone can its true functions be best performed.

It has duties to perform in relation to the moral, political, and economic life of the community, and also in relation to all other phases or kinds of life, because it is the duty of the church to teach doctrines by which each individual may properly regulate his whole life — doctrines of faith and doctrines of charity. It must teach the duty of each man toward his Creator as well

as toward his neighbor. It must show the whole community, directly or indirectly, the proper rules to guide it in determining moral, political, and economic questions, but it should leave the individual free to use his own reasoning faculties and to work out his own life in the world according to his own conscience. It has no means of executing its orders or decrees, except by its appeal to reason and Scripture. If the church is successful in aiding each individual to start on a regenerate life, if it can help him to make the cup and platter clean on the inside, and to have the hands and feet washed, then will the man be every whit clean, and his conduct in worldly and external matters will be above criticism, because it will be regulated by pure motives.

When the whole community is moved by unselfish motives — by love to the neighbor instead of love of self — then will the moral, political, and economic life of the community be unobjectionable.

The church cannot take up purely political questions, those pertaining to the public policy and the administration of the civil affairs of the state, for about these there are differences of judgment and opinion. It cannot conduct political meetings and have political discussions, for that would lessen its usefulness, lower its standing, and be a departure from its distinctive duty. It must teach something spiritual that may appeal to every one — republican, democrat, prohibitionist, reformer, radical, conservative, union man, or non-union man, saint, or sinner. Neither can it undertake to theorize and engage in the discussion of purely economic questions — those relating to the acquisition and distribution of wealth, the relations between capital and labor, etc.— for they are in the domain of politics; but it should and it does teach morals to the community by the life of its members, if sincerely lived, and in every sermon that is preached, for every sermon must or should have a lesson which is applicable to life and which helps the one who hears and receives it to decide what is right and to conform to it, to lead the life of charity, to discharge faithfully every daily duty. If such effect is attained the church fulfils its mis-

sion, for its primary and permanent duty is to save souls from evil by destroying in them the desire and tendency to commit sin.

Swedenborg says in "Arcana Cœlestia," 2054, that: —

> The church in the kingdom of the Lord is like the heart and lungs in man; the interiors of man being conjoined with his externals by means of the heart and lungs, whence life is derived to all the neighboring viscera.
>
> So also it is with the human race. The conjunction with them, of the Lord, and of His heaven, is nearest with the church, but more remote with those who are without the church, who are in the situation of those viscera which live by means of the heart and lungs.

Again: —

> If the Lord's church were to be altogether extinct on the earth, mankind could in no wise exist, but all and each of them would perish. . . .
>
> The church of the Lord on earth is as a heart, hence the whole human race, even those who are out of the church, have life. The cause hereof is utterly unknown to all; but that some idea may be formed, the whole race of mankind on earth is as the body with its parts, in which body the church is as the heart, and unless there were a church, with which, as with a sort of heart, the Lord might be united through heaven and the world of spirits, a disjunction would ensue, and when there was a disjunction of the human race from the Lord, it would instantly perish. (*Ibid.*, 637.)

It will be seen by this last quotation how very important it is for the church to keep right on performing its distinctive part, constantly giving life to the community and holding up an ideal and standard to live by. If it should withdraw any of its energies from this central duty and undertake to perform the more external duties of other members of the body, the whole body would at once suffer.

Again in the same number from which I have just quoted, Swedenborg says: —

> The reason why mankind cannot possibly live, unless it be conjoined with the Lord through heaven and the world of spirits, is because man, regarded in himself, is much viler than the brutes; in case he were left to himself, he would rush headlong to his own destruction and that of all others, inasmuch as he desires nothing but the ruin of himself and of all.

The church is, therefore, required to teach man to shun evils

as sins, so that the life may be made pure in motive and man thereby saved.

Man must be taught that he cannot regenerate himself, that is, form in himself a new heart and a new spirit, for the Lord alone can do this and so he must be taught the doctrine of the Lord.

As said by Swedenborg in the little book entitled the "Doctrine of Life," 114:—

> Christian charity, with every one, consists in doing faithfully the duties of his calling; for thus, if he shuns evils as sins, he daily does good, and is himself his own use in the common body. And so the common good is provided for as well as that of each individual.

It seems, therefore, not so much a question as to whether the New Church has a duty to perform to the community at large, to those outside the church as well as to those inside; for it is plain that it has a vital duty; but the practical question is, How shall it be performed?

In my judgment, it can best be performed by maintaining its regular services for worship; by providing properly for the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the rites and sacraments of the church; the teaching of the Ten Commandments of the Old Testament and the great commandment of the New, to love one another; teaching the doctrines of the Lord, of the holy Scriptures, and of the pure life of charity; and by maintaining a Sunday-school, where the children are regularly taught the same truths in a manner suitable to their respective ages.

When a church society faithfully and fully performs such duties, it is fulfilling its greatest mission, performing its best use, and is discharging its full duty in relation to the moral, political, and economic life of the community.

The sun in the natural world must go on shining, notwithstanding there are clouds, or trees, or planets intervening; the rain from the heavens must keep on falling on the just and on the unjust, in spite of roofs and tents and umbrellas; and so

must the Lord, the sun of the spiritual world, by means of His church on earth, keep on sending His divine truth and His divine love into the hearts and minds of men, wherever they may live and of whatever political faith or social status, no matter what external environment may becloud them; He must, through His church, spread the table for the Holy Supper; and the church must, in His name, continue to welcome all who will to come and partake of the bread of life, and should repel none therefrom.

It is clear, therefore, that the New Church can best aid the community in which it is located by keeping itself free from the many external matters of the state as an organization, so that it may more clearly reflect the light of the spiritual sun and may furnish the opportunity to each individual to enter upon the regenerate life, and so to advance the coming of the Lord's kingdom on earth. If, by teaching the individual, the church can influence his life and give him the true idea of the doctrine of charity, so that he becomes infilled with the principles of right thinking and right living, it can safely trust that individual so taught to take his proper place in the various civic organizations of society, and to discharge his full personal responsibility in the world in such manner as will be best for the good of the community.

JOB BARNARD.

PRIMEVAL MAN.

In his writings Swedenborg describes the character of the most ancient people, and especially of those who constituted the Most Ancient Church, and from his description of their character we may know that they were as to their disposition, spiritual perception, and wisdom far superior to their posterity, out of whom the Ancient Church was formed; and when Swedenborg wrote his works the superiority in character of primeval men was not called into question, except by those who did not believe in the existence of an intelligent Creator and attributed the origin of man to what are called the operations of the laws of nature. It is, however, not so now, for the modern hypothesis that primeval men were at the bottom of the scale of humanity, morally and intellectually inferior to every race of people now in existence who are supposed to have made some advancement in moral and intellectual culture, is now generally regarded by scientific men to be correct. But then they have considered the past and present condition of the human race from only one point of view — the natural and scientific.

In their legitimate sphere of labor scientific men have been good servants as pioneers of progress. They have largely increased our knowledge of the laws of order by which the universe is governed and of the world we inhabit. So wonderful, indeed, have been some of the discoveries they have made that we have ceased to be astonished at what they do discover. They are worthy of all praise for their magnificent achievements. But have they, by their researches, discovered any evidences which may be said to give real and unmistakable support to the hypothesis that primeval men lived in a state of utter barbarism, or even to the notion that as to their moral character and their spiritual life they were the least inferior to the most intelligent and civilized race of people now living? We have no hesi-

tation in saying that no such evidences have been obtained. The hypothesis of utter barbarism is an entirely unconfirmed supposition.

We know there have been tribes, once numerous, of a people that gradually became fewer in number till they ceased to exist, and that there are now some in the process of becoming extinct. We may, therefore, well believe that long before historic times several races of people different in disposition and character had ceased to exist. Now would it be at all possible to acquire any information concerning the real character of an ancient and a long extinct race of people by scientific methods of investigation, unless there were some written documents of theirs preserved which could be discovered and deciphered? Every thoughtful person who considers the question, we think, must come to the conclusion that it would be impossible; and in regard to the most ancient people we have not the slightest reason for supposing that they were acquainted with the art of writing, of communicating information concerning themselves to their posterity in a documentary form.

Some very rudely formed stone implements and other articles of use have been found, which were made by a people who lived ages before historic times; and if they were made by the most ancient people, what other kind of information can there be derived from the examination of them than what is strictly confined to the mechanical skill and intelligence the most ancient people possessed? Both, doubtless, were of a very low order compared with the intelligence and skill which the builders of Solomon's temple possessed. But a low degree of mechanical intelligence and skill is by no means incompatible with the possession of a high degree of spiritual intelligence and wisdom — the intelligence to distinguish between good and evil and the wisdom to choose the good and to refuse the evil. And though the most ancient people must have been entirely ignorant of many things well known to us and could not have acquired much scientific knowledge, they were human beings, endowed with the faculties which differentiate man from the

lower animals. And because they were human beings they could love what they knew was worthy to be loved and would desire to make the best use possible of the knowledge they possessed. They could live together in harmony, every one striving to do his best to increase the universal good.

In regard to merely natural and scientific knowledge, no doubt, there has been a gradual advancement made in the acquisition of it from the beginning of the existence of the human race. It does not, however, require much reflection to know that a people may, while they are making progress in the acquisition of such knowledge, become more sensual, cruel, and immoral, and, therefore, less truly rational and wise. We know that there are now some in every department of art and science whose moral character will not bear inspection, and we also know from the historical records of ancient nations that there were some who were wise counsellors and more than honored for their unceasing efforts to better the condition of the afflicted and oppressed who had not much knowledge of art or science. Facts like these are sufficient to prove, if proof be needed, that neither the external condition of a people nor the extent of their scientific knowledge supplies us with a standard by which we may form a correct opinion in regard to their moral character, spiritual intelligence, and life. We may, however, say that no people have been more barbarous, that is, more inhumane, than those have who received an excellent education on subjects relating to matters of life or conduct, but who have allowed their animal passions and their love of self and of the world to control their actions; for they have had no respect for law and order.

A number of people forming a society or a nation form the character of the society or the nation, and what is true of a single individual, namely, that it is the ruling love of an individual which forms his character, is also true of a society or a nation. And what has been the character in past ages of the most powerful nations of the world, considered from a moral and spiritual point of view? It has not been of a high order,

for in all of them the love of dominion was the ruling love and all of them engaged in wars of extermination. Indeed, the moral and spiritual character of primeval men could not possibly have been of a lower order. And will the character of Christian nations, now the most powerful nations in the world, bear impartial examination? Their large armies and ships of war give a negative answer to the question. Their people are divided into classes often warring against each other to gain the supremacy. Those who are rich have to be constantly on their guard against spoliation, or they would be deprived of their wealth; and those who have to work for their daily bread have to combine to resist oppression, or they would not receive what was justly due to them. And it cannot be denied that the worst forms of offences against moral law and order are committed by the people who belong to what are called Christian nations. In them the divine command binding upon all Christians to obey, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them," is more frequently unobserved than it is observed. In considering, therefore, the character of the human race from the commencement of its existence up to the present time, we should bear in mind the fact that progression in the acquisition of material or scientific knowledge is one thing, and quite another to advance in moral culture and spiritual wisdom.

There are human beings living beyond the borders of civilization possessing every human faculty who are said to be ignorant of almost everything worth knowing. These people are regarded as supplying testimony in favor of the hypothesis being true that primeval men did live in a state of utter barbarism, for they are supposed to be existing specimens of what they were; but in the past, it is well known, that there have been human and also natural causes of intellectual degradation. The further a people live and have lived from the centres of mental activity for many generations, the more ignorant they are and the more wretched is their material condition. And the deplorable condition, in which some people are now found to be,

may be satisfactorily accounted for by the supposition that their ancestors were driven by oppression from the centres of mental activity and compelled to reside where they could only obtain the means of subsistence. Their posterity would become less and less intelligent till they became ignorant of almost everything we regard as worth knowing.

The late Duke of Argyle wrote some interesting articles, which appeared in *Good Words* for 1868 under the title of "Recent Speculations on Primeval Man." At considerable length he considered the modern hypothesis which affirms that the primitive condition of man was not merely one of ignorance, but of utter barbarism. He endeavored to show, and we think successfully, that the evidences which had been adduced in support of it are unreliable. He also made some observations on the hypothesis propounded by Dr. Whately, the Archbishop of Dublin, in his "Origin of Civilization." He observed that: —

> The archbishop's position is this, that mere savages, that is to say, men in the lowest degree, or even anything approaching to the lowest degree of barbarism in which they can possibly subsist at all, never did and never can, unaided, raise themselves into a higher condition. . . . He holds it to be a complete moral certainty that man left in what is called a state of nature, that is, with the faculties man is born with, not at all unfolded or exercised by education, never did and never can raise themselves from that condition.

The archbishop's hypothesis is equivalent to affirming that no human beings living in a state of nature and possessing the power to perceive the differences which were constantly occurring in their environments and of reflecting on what they perceived ever did or ever could by their observations and reflections obtain the slightest information which would enable them to improve their material condition; which seems to be absurd. The Duke was naturally inclined to be sarcastic. He wrote:—

> Did Dr. Whately mean that man must have been instructed how to throw a stone, or to wield a stick, or to hurl a javelin, or to build a hut? And, if so, at what point did such lessons in mechanics stop?

He then proceeded to give his own opinion as to how man did acquire his first artistic knowledge, in the form of another question: —

> Is it not evident the more perfect we suppose the first man to have been, so far as regards at least his powers of thought, of observation, and of reflection, the less needful it is to suppose that the few and simple arts necessary for the sustenance of his life were communicated to him in any other form than that of intuitive powers of perception and discovery?

In thus attributing to primeval man the possession of intuitive powers of perception and discovery, he held a strong position. For though man is not a mere animal, he has an animal nature, and all animals are born into every knowledge necessary for their sustenance, protection, and the propagation of their species. We do not, however, suppose that the Duke used the term perception with precisely the same meaning Swedenborg attached to it when he treated of the perception the most ancient people enjoyed; nevertheless, his opinion in regard to the way they acquired their knowledge of what was necessary for their sustenance is in agreement with much that Swedenborg wrote about primitive man.

We have already seen that by scientific methods of investigation no information can be obtained concerning what was the moral and spiritual character of the most ancient people. The framing of scientific hypotheses on that subject is a useless intellectual effort. It is only from the writings of Swedenborg, we believe, that reliable information can be acquired with respect to what was their character and the nature of their genius. And though Swedenborg was a profound philosopher and a scientific man of the first order, he propounded no hypothesis concerning the disposition, mental attainments, and character of the most ancient people. The information he gave in his writings he obtained in the only way it was possible for real information to be acquired, and it is all of a positive matter-of-fact kind. He was divinely prepared to receive the information, for he, in the most solemn manner, declared that the Lord opened the sight of his spirit in order that he might be able to

receive from the Lord a clear understanding of the internal sense of the Word, and also to converse with angels and spirits; and the evidence of the truth of this assertion may be found in almost every page of the works he wrote after the sight of his spirit was opened. He was permitted to have daily intercourse with the inhabitants of the spiritual world and he conversed with some angels who when they lived in the world were men of the Most Ancient Church, and through their instrumentality the Lord instructed him with respect to what was the intellectual, moral, and spiritual condition of the most ancient people. Real information will bear the most thorough examination; and the more Swedenborg's statements about what he saw and heard in the spiritual world are examined, the more will they be found to be worthy of credence.

With respect to the disposition and genius of the most ancient people we are told that: —

> In the present day we have no community of feeling with them, their disposition being altogether different from our own; but to give a faint idea of their genius, it may be mentioned that they knew what was true by virtue of what was good. (Arcana Cœlestia, 200.)

As we have no community of feeling with them in regard to spiritual things, for they are the things which Swedenborg referred to, we have come to the conclusion that the most ancient people passed through states of thought and affection such as we have never experienced, and such as it is now impossible for us to have a full and clear understanding of what they were like. For unless we have had an experimental knowledge of those external states of the mind called sensations, we have no real understanding of what they are like; and how much more must this be the case with those internal states of consciousness which some have an experimental knowledge of, but which we have not?

Some very thoughtful readers, however, of Swedenborg's writings believe that it is now possible for those who are true external members of the New Church, who by regeneration

become true internal members of it, to have an experimental knowledge of precisely similar states to those which the most ancient people passed through whilst they were being regenerated, because all may have not only the spiritual but also the celestial degree of their mind opened to receive what flows from the Lord through heaven. Doubtless every true external member of the church may have the celestial degree of his mind opened by regeneration, but the opening of that degree will effect no change in his genius. What regeneration actually does for a man of the church is that it brings the things of his external mind into correspondence with and under the government of those of his internal mind, so that in the degree he is regenerated his natural thoughts and desires present no hindrances to his reception of influx from the Lord. And as Swedenborg clearly teaches us that those who are of the spiritual church are of the spiritual genius and receive influx from the Lord in a different manner from what those did who were of the celestial church and of the celestial genius, we think that our knowledge of the states through which the members of the Most Ancient Church passed may be compared to the knowledge the blind have of colors and the deaf of sounds.

Swedenborg describes the difference there is between the celestial church and the spiritual in the following extract: —

> The celestial church has place with the man who is capable of being regenerated or made a church as to the voluntary part, whereas the spiritual church has place with a man who is capable of being regenerated only as to the intellectual part. The Most Ancient Church, which was before the flood, was celestial, because with those who were of that church there was something entire in the voluntary part; but the Ancient Church, which was after the flood, was spiritual, because there was not anything entire in the voluntary part, but only in the intellectual. . . . That the intellectual part with those who are of the spiritual church is regenerated may be manifest from this consideration, but the man of that church has no perception of truth from good, as those had who were of the celestial church; but he must first learn the truth which is of faith, and imbibe it into his intellectual part, and thereby from truth know what is good, and after he has thence known it he is enabled to think it, next to will it, and at length to do it, and in this case a new will is formed with him by the Lord in his

intellectual part. By this new will the spiritual man is elevated by the Lord into heaven, evil still remaining in his former will, which will, on this occasion, is miraculously separated by a superior force, whereby he is withheld from evil and kept in good. But the man of the celestial church was regenerated as to the voluntary part, by imbibing from infancy the good of charity, and when he had gained the perception thereof, he was led into the perception of love to the Lord; hence the truths of faith appeared to him in the intellectual part as in a mirror. The understanding and the will with him made altogether one mind; for it was perceived by the things in the understanding what was in the will; herein consisted the integrity of the first man, who signified the celestial church. (*Ibid.*, 5113.)

In another passage we are told that: —

With those who were of the Most Ancient Church because they were internal men, the Lord flowed in by an internal way, and taught them what was good; the varieties and differences of good were to them truths, and hence they knew what each and all of the things in the world represented in the Lord's kingdom. . . . But those who were of the Ancient Church were not internal, but external men, wherefore with them the Lord could not flow in and teach what was good by an internal way, but by an external way. (*Ibid.*, 4489.)

Thus we learn from what we are taught in these extracts that those who were men of the Most Ancient Church were born with the will of good, that is, with a disposition favorable to receiving from the Lord what constitutes the church and also heaven in man. They were born into the world with something entire of good, so that the Lord could flow in with them by an internal way, that is, by the way of the will, and teach them what was good and effect their regeneration. From their infancy they received from the Lord spiritual good, the good of charity, and when they had acquired a perception of that good they were initiated into celestial good — the good of love to the Lord. We also learn that those who were of the Ancient Church were not born with the will of good, but with a will hereditarily inclined to evil; that they had nothing entire in their voluntary part and that the Lord could not flow in with them by an internal way and teach them what was good, but only by an external way — the way of their understanding. The Lord led them by truth

into good and thereby formed a new will in their understanding and elevated them to heaven.

The most ancient people were not of the celestial genius by regeneration, but by the constitution of their mind. They were of that genius because their two faculties of will and understanding were so perfectly united that they formed one mind, in the sense that it was impossible for them to think one thing and to will another, or to will one thing and to think another. And before they became entirely defiled by hereditary evil they were in the true order for the reception of influx from the Lord, because they had some degree of good in their will into which He could flow, which we are told "appeared in the intellectual part as in a mirror." Hence, what was in their will formed what was in their understanding after its own image; so that their character was determined by the state of their will in relation to good. Those of them who became members of the Most Ancient Church were first led into its external good, the good of mutual love, and afterwards into its internal good, the good of love to the Lord, and being in the true order of life, they were mediums of union between the Lord and the ultimate things of nature. For we are taught that:—

> Man is so created that the Divine things of the Lord may descend through him into the ultimate things of nature and from the ultimate things of nature ascend to him, so that man might be the medium of union between the Divine and the world of nature, and thus by man as a uniting medium the very ultimate things of nature might have life from the Divine, which would have been the case if man had lived according to order. . . . In such a state were the most ancient people who were celestial men, for whatever they apprehended by any sense was to them a medium of thinking concerning the Lord and His kingdom. Hence was the delight they received from worldly and terrestrial things. Yea, further when they thus contemplated the interior and ultimate things of nature they appeared to them as if they were alive, for the life from which they descended was in their internal sight and perception, and the objects presented before their eyes were as images of that life, which images although they were inanimate, nevertheless were animated in their sight. (*Ibid.*, 3702.)

Now, as the ultimate things of nature are effects produced

on the natural plane of existence by divine, and, therefore, spiritual causes, they must necessarily correspond to divine things in the Lord — to those things in Him which were the direct and immediate causes of their creation. And according to the philosophy of the New Church, the ultimate or natural degree, to which of course the ultimate things of nature belong, is "the complex, continent, and basis of the prior degrees" (Divine Love and Wisdom, 209). Hence, though in themselves the ultimate things of nature are not anything more than inanimate material forms, they are recipients of the Lord's inflowing life, and, being recipients of it, they react with it in the performance of uses. "They are uses in the order and degree in which they have relation to man, and by man to the Lord their Creator." (*Ibid.*, 327.)

Man is the medium of union between the Lord and the ultimate things of nature, because he has an internal mind formed according to the image of heaven and an external mind formed according to the image of the world. By the former he has communication with heaven, but it is now an unconscious communication, and by the latter he has a conscious communication with the world, through the medium of his organs of sense. He has, therefore, in his internal mind spiritual things derived from the Lord through heaven, and in his external mind natural things received also from the Lord but through the world; and in the degree his natural things are made subordinate to his spiritual, in the same degree he is in the true order of human life and is a medium of union between the Lord and the ultimate things of nature. Swedenborg observed that: —

> Man is so created that as to his internal mind he is formed to the image of heaven, and as to his external mind to the image of the world, to the intent that heaven and the world may be conjoined and that the Lord may flow in out of heaven into the world and govern it, in particular with every man and in general with all, and thus conjoin both, and thereby make a resemblance of heaven to exist in the world. (Arcana Cœlestia, 10156.)

From this teaching we learn that every man, by virtue of possessing an internal and an external mind, may have heaven

and the world with him conjoined; and that if they are, the Lord will flow in and make the world with him a resemblance of heaven. And in the degree the world with man is a resemblance of heaven, man can do the will of the Lord in the earth of his natural or external mind as he does it in the heaven of his spiritual or internal mind.

But as the law of influx is that it is into internal things and thence into external things, but only when the latter correspond to the former, it follows that it is only those who are being regenerated by the Lord and have the church established in their souls, who receive influx from the Lord into their worldly things, because it is only so far as man is regenerated that what belongs to his external mind is in correspondence with what belongs to his internal mind. Hence, it is only those who are being regenerated who form the medium of union between the Lord and the world of nature. In them the ultimate things of nature perform their specific uses and through them they ascend to God their Creator.

Now with the members of the Most Ancient Church, when the tree of life was in the midst of the garden, there was a full and complete correspondence between what they received from the Lord through heaven and what they derived from the world. The worldly things, therefore, with them did not present any hindrance to the descent of influx, but were prepared vessels for its reception. Such being the case, the Lord could do all things with them. Hence there was a continual influx into them and an efflux from them of the Lord's divine love and wisdom, so that heaven had its appearance and representation in their worldly sphere of life and action. They were so near to the Lord and heaven in thought and affection that:—

> The objects of the external senses, such as terrestrial and worldly things were to them as nothing, nor did they perceive anything of delight in them, but only in the things they signified and represented, wherefore when they saw terrestrial objects they did not think about them, but only about what they signified and represented, which to them were most delightful, they being such things as exist in heaven, from which they saw the Lord Himself. (*Ibid.*, 1122.)

And because they knew what the things they saw with their natural eyes signified and represented they were able: —

To discourse with angels and to be with them in the kingdom of the Lord which is in the heavens, at the same time they were in His kingdom on earth, or in the church. Thus natural things with them were conjoined with spiritual, and corresponded thereto in all respects. (*Ibid.*, 2995.)

It is, therefore, obvious that the intelligence of the most ancient people, who were members of the Most Ancient Church, concerning spiritual subjects and the relation all natural things bear to their spiritual causes far exceeded the intelligence possessed by any at the present day who are members of the church of our Lord's second advent.

Swedenborg, however, before he commenced to give the spiritual sense of the latter part of the third chapter of Genesis observed: —

This and the preceding chapters to the verses now under consideration treat of the most ancient people and their regeneration, first of those who lived like wild beasts [*sicut feræ*], at length of those who became spiritual men, and then of those who became celestial men and constituted the Most Ancient Church. (*Ibid.*, 286.)

Some readers of the writings have inferred from what Swedenborg said in this passage, that the first condition of the most ancient people was not much, if any, superior to that of wild beasts. It is, however, we believe a wrong inference to draw from Swedenborg's words, because it is not in agreement with much that Swedenborg wrote concerning their condition, and certainly not with what we are taught in the following passage: —

If man were not tainted with hereditary evil the rational principle would be born immediately from the marriage of the celestial things of the internal man with its spiritual things, and through the rational would be born the scientific, so that man would have with him all the rational principle and all the scientific, at the instant of his coming into the world, for this would be according to the order of influx, as may be concluded from the fact that all animals whatsoever are born into all the scientific faculty which is necessary and conducive to their sustenance, their protection, their habita-

tion, and their procreation, because their nature is according to order. How much more would this be the case with man had not order been destroyed in him, for he alone is born into no science. The cause of his being so born is hereditary evil derived from father and mother, in consequence of which all his faculties are in a contrary direction to what is true and good, and cannot be reduced into forms corresponding to them by an immediate influx of celestial and spiritual things from the Lord. (*Ibid.*, 1902.)

If all that is said in this passage be carefully considered, it will be seen that the first condition of the most ancient people must have been far superior to that of wild beasts. Man was created by the Lord who is order itself, and as He is order itself He could not have created him but according to the most perfect laws of order and in order. Such being the case, man did not come into existence with all his faculties turned in an opposite direction to what is good and true, so that he would not receive influx from the Lord according to the order of influx. Now as the order impressed on man at his creation could not have been destroyed by hereditary evil derived from father and mother, it follows from what we are taught in the passage that he had from the marriage of the celestial things of his internal man with its spiritual things all the rational principle and all the scientific immediately he was created.

In what sense, then, are we to understand that, before the most ancient people became spiritual men, "they lived like wild beasts"? In the sense that they lived no higher life than an orderly natural life, the only kind of life the beasts of the field are capable of living, because they have not an internal mind formed according to the image of heaven. "Man is born an animal but he is made a man" (Divine Love and Wisdom, 270). He has three discrete degrees of mind, the natural degree, the spiritual, and the celestial, and at first he lives like an animal, because only the lowest or natural degree of his mind is then opened, but he begins to be a man when the spiritual degree is opened, and he comes to be more fully a man when the celestial degree is opened. These degrees, with the most ancient people, who became internal men of the celestial church, were succes-

sively opened, and with them, as it is with all now, the natural degree was first opened, but because they were born with the will of good it was agreeable to their nature to live the life of natural good, and when in their external man vessels were formed and prepared for the reception of spiritual good from the Lord, the spiritual degree was opened and afterwards the celestial. Their regeneration was progressive, and it was effected by influx from the Lord into their will of good according to the degree of good they freely received and appropriated to life. The Lord led them from natural good into spiritual and finally into celestial good.

There is really no difficulty in understanding the meaning of what is said in the passage, if it be taken as containing a concise statement of the ascent which the most ancient people made during their regeneration from a natural state of thought and perception till they became internal men of the Most Ancient Church.

We have seen that those who were of the celestial church differed from all who are of the spiritual church, in that they were capable of being regenerated as to their voluntary part. They differed also in another respect, for in the degree they were regenerated they had developed in them a power of discernment, in relation to goods and truths, of a more interior kind than is possessed by those who are of the spiritual church — a discernment of goods and truths which Swedenborg called perception.

Now the term "perception" in philosophical usage denotes either the reference the mind makes to an external object when it has a sensation, as being the occasion or cause of its having the sensation, or it may denote the mind's recognition of its states of consciousness, which have not been occasioned by the presence of external objects and this recognition is called internal perception. This meaning given to the term made it to be the best Swedenborg could employ to make as clear as possible to the understanding of those who would read his writings the kind of spiritual discernment of heavenly verities the most ancient people enjoyed.

In explaining the spiritual signification of "to feel," Swedenborg defined what perception is, namely, that it is an internal sensation. He observed: —

That to feel is the inmost and the all of perception is from this ground, because all sensation has reference to the sense of touch, and the touch is derived and exists from perception, for sensation is nothing else than external perception and perception is nothing else than internal sensation. Moreover, all sensation and all perception, although it appears so various, has yet reference to one common and universal sense, namely, the touch; the varieties, as the taste, the smell, the hearing, and the sight, which are external sensations, are no other than the genera thereof, arising from the internal sensation, that is, from the perception. . . . All perception, that is, internal sensation, exists from good, but not from truth, unless from good by truth, for the Divine life of the Lord flows into good, and through good into truth and thus produces perception. (*Ibid.*, 3528.)

From what we are here taught we may say that perception is an internal state of consciousness, and it is very evident that if a man be not conscious of his mental states he has no perception of what they are. Now with the men of the Most Ancient Church their consciousness in regard to what was good and true was of such a nature that they knew from it when they reflected on anything which had been stored up in their memory whether it was good and true. But those who are of the spiritual church have not the same kind of consciousness. Though they may have their memory richly furnished with truths they have been taught from the Word, they do not when they reflect on them immediately, know that they are truths. Moreover, because their voluntary part is altogether defiled by hereditary evils, they cannot be gifted with the perception of good and of truth such as the Lord was continually endowing those with who were men of the celestial church. In regard to the nature of the perception of goods and truths they had, we read:—

They had from the Lord continual perception which was of such a nature that when they reflected on what was treasured up in the memory, they instantly perceived whether it was true and good, and so clearly that when anything false presented itself they not only avoided it but even regarded it with horror. (*Ibid.*, 125.)

And we further read that:—

Those who are in the Lord's celestial kingdom from their intellectual part do not know, but perceive truths, for the good implanted in the will is presented in its quality and in its form in the understanding, and is there in a light as it were flaming; the form of good and the quality thereof to them is truth, which is not seen, but is perceived from good. (*Ibid.*, 9818.)

Thus, their perception consisted in perceiving the form and the quality of the good which the Lord had implanted in their voluntary part. It was, therefore, a continual gift to them from the Lord increasing in the degree their capacity to receive good from the Lord increased. We should, however, fall into an error were we to suppose that they could have acquired any knowledge of celestial truths by their own unaided reason. They were in the world of nature, and there is nothing in nature which could reveal to them what is above the plane of nature. They could by observation, reflection, and experience, gain an increasing knowledge of what is within the plane of nature, but to perceive and know what is beyond and above it, revelation was as much a necessity to them as it is to us.

The revelation they received was not given to them in the form of a written word, but immediately from the Lord, for:—

The men of the Most Ancient Church had immediate revelations, through intercourse with spirits and angels, and also by means of visions and dreams from the Lord. By these means it was given them to know in a general way what was good and true, and when they had obtained this kind of knowledge, then by means of perception they confirmed general principles, by innumerable things which were the particulars or singulars of the generals to which they had relation. Thus generals were every day confirmed, for whatever was not in agreement with generals, that they perceived not to be so, and whatever was in agreement with them they perceived to be so. (*Ibid.*, 597.)

Again we read:—

The man of the Most Ancient Church had revelations by which he was initiated into the perception of goods and truths, and because they were inseminated into his voluntary part he received without fresh instruction innumerable things, so that from one general he knew the particulars and

singulars, which at the present day must first be learnt to be known. (*Ibid.*, 502.)

From this teaching it is clear that it was by the revelations they received from the Lord they acquired the knowledge they had of celestial and spiritual verities. And, further, that it was because goods and truths were inseminated into their voluntary part, they were endowed — through the influx of the Lord's love and wisdom into them by an internal way with perception — with the power to perceive the particulars and singulars contained in the general truths communicated to them by means of revelation.

But their perception appears to have been confined to immediately perceiving what was within celestial and spiritual things, for we are told that: —

> The perception of a church consists in its members perceiving from the Lord what is good and true like the angels, thus not what is good and true of civil society, but what is good and true of love and faith in the Lord. (*Ibid.*, 502.)

In the ordinary way, as we have observed, by the exercise of their human powers, they could learn what was good and true in relation to their life in the world, and because they had a perception of what is good and true of love and faith in the Lord, and were in the will of good, all the knowledge they acquired, in the ordinary way, they applied in the performance of good uses.

The whole teaching of Swedenborg concerning the condition of the most ancient people, as to their disposition and spiritual intelligence, whilst it is not contradicted by any known facts, is in full harmony with all we know of the character of the Divine Being, who from His very nature must have desired to impart unto man He created in His own image and likeness every human perfection.

But those who maintain that primeval man lived in a state of utter barbarism are at their wits' end to satisfactorily account for the origin of the almost universal belief in the immortality of man. Herbert Spencer supposed that it had its origin in

dreams. According to his hypothesis, some men in very early times and of a very low degree of intelligence saw in their dreams their departed friends, and, therefore, came to the conclusion that they were living in another world. But surely it is more reasonable to attribute the origin of the belief to something more real than dreams — to some having actually seen and conversed with those they had known when they were living in the world. They are also confronted with another difficulty, which is, to explain how those who were in an utter state of barbarism could, unaided, raise themselves above that condition. History supplies them with no example of a people having done so.

Dr. Whately, we believe, was correct in saying that "Mere savages, that is to say, men in the lowest degree, or anything approaching to the lowest degree of barbarism, never did and never can, unaided, raise themselves into a higher condition." The mistake he made was, he took it for granted that primeval man was in a state of utter barbarism. Had he sufficiently considered the character of the Lord who created man, he would not have fallen into such an error, for he would have seen that the Lord could not have created man other than in a state of perfect order, and a state of barbarism is not an orderly condition of human existence.

Now a people are living in a state of order who have a clear perception of spiritual truths and embody them in work done which will increase the universal good. Such a people, according to Swedenborg, the men who constituted the Most Ancient Church were. And if man had not fallen, we may well believe that the people of all races, generation after generation, would not only have increased in perceptive power in relation to love and faith in the Lord, but also in scientific knowledge, that is, in the knowledge of things belonging to the plane of nature, and that order would now prevail among the people of all nations as it does prevail in nature's economy.

T. K. Payton.

THE SEVEN CHURCHES.

PHILADELPHIA.

We have thus far thought of the meaning of five of the seven churches, or of certain aspects of their meaning. We have seen that each of them represents some special view or emphasis of religious faith or life. Thus Ephesus lays stress on correctness of belief; Smyrna on the inward spirit of religion; Pergamos on external religious activities and reforms; Thyatira on the church's historical basis and its temporal power and authority; and Sardis on its forms and sacraments. And we have seen that, while in a normal condition of the church, these various forms of emphasis are not harmful, but helpful, the tendency in the church's decline is so to exaggerate them as to separate the various functions of the church from each other and from its divine source of life, making them warring factions instead of complemental parts like the various organs of the body, or the different gems in a king's crown.

But in the sixth of the seven churches, or Philadelphia, no over-emphasis or one-sidedness is apparent. As we read the description of its people, or the divine commendation of them, it would seem that we have here described almost an ideal body. No exception appears to be taken in the message to its course. Its only apparent fault is its lack of strength. It combines the various excellencies of the other churches. Like Ephesus, it has been faithful to the Master's word; like Pergamos, it has exalted the life of religion, but without denying the Lord's name, or without claiming divinity for man or merit for his works. It has shown patience and a degree of power to resist the world's temptations. Its very name — Philadelphia or brotherly love — indicates its quality. The Lord declares that He loves this church, and not for what it might be, but for what it is.

It may not be out of place here to refer to a kind of resemblance between this sixth church and the sixth day of creation, although it may not be best to attempt at present to find any general parallelism between the seven days and seven churches. On the first day of creation was given light; on the second a division between the waters above and below the firmament; on the third vegetable life was formed; on the fourth the sun, moon, and stars; on the fifth the lower animals; on the sixth the higher animals and finally man. In man were gathered all the creations of the past. For him the light came, the waters were divided, the land was separated from the sea, vegetation and animal life were formed. All were made for him, and he was given dominion over all. And so, in the sixth church, all the excellencies of the other churches seem to be gathered. It is the church of faith and good works combined. It appears to be the crown of all the churches, as man is the crown of creation. For the divine promise concerning Philadelphia is that on it will be written the name of the New Jerusalem, the city of God descending from heaven — the crowning promise of the Bible. And before it is set an open door, which no man can shut.

Philadelphia does not say, with the Ephesian extremists, "We are saved by belief"; nor with the extremists of Pergamos, "No matter what you believe, if you only act right"; but it combines faith and works in word and deed. It does not say, with the radical Smyrnean, "The church is an interior and spiritual thing, and not an outward organization"; nor with the Thyatiran, "The external church, established by the apostles, is the real church which holds the keys of heaven"; but, believing with the Smyrnean, that the spiritual is the most vital, and that without it the external has no life, it still maintains, with the Thyatiran, the necessity of the external and of its union with the internal. It denies, however, that the keys of heaven are in the hands of the church, or that Peter and his successors have them in charge, but the Lord alone; for, in addressing this church, the divine Master says: "These things saith he who . . . hath the

key of David, who openeth and no man shutteth, and shutteth and no man openeth; behold, I have set before you an open door, and no man can shut it." The love of the Lord Jesus Christ sets before all, in one sense, an open door, which no man, no church, can shut. His spirit of love and truth and corresponding act make heaven. All are free to enter there who desire to do so, but only those desire to do so who are in harmony with His spirit and life. In an especial sense, however, the door is open only to those who are in harmony with that spirit and life. "Blessed are they that wash their robes, that they may enter in." And as this is true of the Philadelphian Church, the Lord says of it: "I have set before you [differently from any other] an open door."

But now let us observe a little more carefully, and in the light of the words addressed to this church, how well balanced it is. First, in the threefold description of its quality: "thou hast a little strength"; thou "hast kept my word"; thou "hast not denied my name." Its strength is love in act; its obedience to the Lord's word is its regard to love in thought; its acceptance of the divine name is its ascription of all love, all truth, and all power to the Lord alone. And to him who is thus faithful in act, in thought, and in the supreme realm of the heart or the will, the divine speaker, the Son of Man, promises an answering threefold blessing: "I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, the New Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God, and mine own new name."

In explanation of these words, the divinely authorized expounder of the Scripture (as we think of him) declares substantially that this is the meaning: they who are meant by the Philadelphian Church will have the spirit of truth, or the name of God, written in their hearts; they will have its doctrines as an external revelation, or the city of God, verified to them by an inward experience, and thus written in their hearts; and, above all, they will worship the Lord Jesus Christ alone in His divinely human person, or will have written upon them His new name or quality of life given for a new age of the world.

Here we have foreshadowed the vision of the holy city New Jerusalem, described at the end of the book, whose name, among other names, shall be written upon the members of the Philadelphian Church. What is this holy city New Jerusalem, which descends from heaven to earth, when the first heaven and earth have passed away? When the Christian Church held firmly to the thought that sun, moon, stars, and earth were, at some future time, to be involved in one grand catastrophe and a new sky and a new earth formed to become the home of all past generations of people whose souls would be united with their risen material bodies, the city New Jerusalem, descending to the new earth, was a picture of heaven, not of a new revelation and church on our present earth. But since that thought of the New Jerusalem as heaven on a new literal earth has mostly passed away from the minds of churchmen, the city of God, descending from heaven to earth, has become a bit of poetic imagery, without definite meaning. But in the faith of the New Church, it means a new doctrine revealed from heaven for the use of a new age of the church, leading onward and upward into a new state of love and life.

It is our belief that the foundations of the faith of this new church have been laid, that is, its foundation principles have been made known. And when we examine these principles, we shall find that they are broad and inclusive and not narrow or exclusive. We shall find that they include all that has been beautiful and uplifting in the Christianity of the past. We shall find that they have come into the world not to destroy, but to fulfil. Only the narrow, the perverted; the untrue is destroyed. The true is preserved and established on a firm and rational basis. The good, also, is preserved. Beginning with the Ten Commandments of old time, the new teachings add to them an inner and spiritual meaning, which appeals to an interior understanding, and leads or should lead to an interior and higher life. The city New Jerusalem, or the doctrine of the new Christian faith, lies four-square and its length is as large as its breadth. It looks out towards all the four quarters of the world. It

reaches forth a helping hand while uttering a voice of kindly warning to all the other cities of Asia — to Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamos, Thyatira, Sardis, and even to Laodicea, so blind and poor and naked. It has many things to say, which the world at large cannot bear now, but its central affirmation, its holy of holies of truth, declares that the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, in His glorified form and personality and nearness and perfect, yearning love for His every child, erring or deserving, is the one God, the one Father of us all. His love, pure, unfailing, dwells at the summit of creation and at the heart of life. He came at Bethlehem to be seen by the eyes, and now He has come again, inwardly, to be seen and known by the sight of the spirit. He sends His angel to testify to us these things in the churches. And as He called Himself, in His first coming, the door of the sheep — the good shepherd leading on to green pastures and still waters, so to the church in Philadelphia He says: "I have set before you an open door." The love of the Lord Jesus opens up to the very throne of God. The door is open to all, because the Lord loves all and would save all. No man, no church, faithful to Him, can shut that door. He that sees the Saviour sees the Father, and he who sees the Father sees the glorified Jesus Christ.

Is it asked, But where is this perfect, all-embracing Church of Philadelphia? Does one small body, which holds in trust the truths which are to distinguish this new church, claim that in this body dwells the spirit of the Church of Philadelphia? It makes no such claim. Where the real church is, the divine Master only knows. We only claim that its truth has been revealed from above, its foundations laid. Some see it more clearly than others. Few, if any, see it as a grand whole. Some have laid hold of one of its aspects, others of other phases of it. A very few have had deep experience of the truth of its central feature of faith. We believe it in general, because we cannot help it. It appeals to our understanding. It bids us go forward to a higher, nobler life, in spite of our dreadful weaknesses and failures. And so we organize, not as *the* New Church, but

only as a company of people who seek to be led towards that higher life. We hold up its principles as the paths to the real church. "Blessed are they who do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city."

"The spirit and the bride," the Lord and heaven, say to all who are asking the way to Zion, with their faces thitherward, "Come." And in furtherance of the command, "Let him that heareth say, Come," so does the body which stands for the new revelation say to those who are seeking for the Way, the Truth, and the Life, "Come." "Can any good come out of Nazareth? Come and see."

LAODICEA.

In the course of our thought upon the seven churches in Asia, or their practical meaning for to-day, we have reached the seventh and last — the church in Laodicea. With all the wretchedness and misery of its fallen condition, we may find that in its integrity it stands for a state even better than Philadelphia — a seventh or Sabbath state of celestial love — the highest phase of the New Church.

This church, as literally described in the message sent to it by the glorified Master, appears to be not only the last to be mentioned, but the last in spiritual vitality. It is the only one of the seven churches of which nothing good is directly said, just as Philadelphia is the only one of which no evil is said. Of all the rest, except Philadelphia, both good and evil qualities are mentioned, but Laodicea might appear wholly condemned except for the words, "As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten; be zealous, therefore, and repent." Where there is something for the Lord to love, there is at least a possibility of good.

The faults of Laodicea, unlike the others, are told wholly in symbols. It is neither cold nor hot, but lukewarm. Thinking of heaven as one grand human organism, with all the functions of a single human being, and of the great concourse of people

passing on into the other world as food to build up and strengthen that grand organism, and remembering that the intermediate world, which they first enter, as answering, in a spiritual way, to the digestive system of that grand organism, the Laodicean element is described as being as nauseous to heaven and so to the Lord, whose spirit makes heaven, as some kinds of food are, but especially as lukewarm water is to the human stomach. "Because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth." Not only are they a lukewarm people, but self-satisfied and proud. Laodicea says, "I am rich, increased with goods, and have need of nothing," and knows not that it is miserable, poor, blind, naked, and is counselled to buy of the Lord the refined gold, and raiment to cover its nakedness, and anoint its blind eyes with eye-salve.

It is an interesting fact that Laodicea was almost destroyed by an earthquake a little before the time the Revelation was written, and that the people in their pride refused help from Rome, answering that they had need of nothing; also a fact that a medical school existed there, which supplied a famous remedy for diseases of the eyes. We observe, then, a reason for the reference to its pride and to the eye-salve.

But the message tells further how the divine Master and Lover of men stands at the door of their hearts knocking. If they will open the door, He will come in.

What signifies this lukewarmness, this mingling of the cold and the heat? for here we have the keynote of the Laodicean character. The heat is love; the cold is the lack of heavenly love. How plain is it that we have here described the particular danger that our Lord told thus: "Either make the tree good, and its fruit good; or else make the tree corrupt, and its fruit corrupt"; and by these words: "No man can serve two masters . . . ye cannot serve God and mammon." Far better that one should be ignorant of the truth, or else reject it when first heard, than to receive it, accept it, profess it, and yet inwardly reject it by seeking first the kingdom of the world, placing one's ruling affections here, and laying up one's chief treasure here. In this

case there is a kind of profanation, a mingling of good and evil, which results in evil of a deeper dye than the ignorant sinner is capable of. Hence the Lord's description of the unclean spirit gone out of a man returning again and bringing seven other spirits more wicked than himself, who enter in and dwell there, so that the last state of that man is worse than the first. And the same is alluded to in the Old Testament where Elijah at Mount Carmel says to the people: "How long halt ye between two opinions? If the Lord be God, follow him: but if Baal, then follow him." Do not try to mingle two opposites. "Follow," not merely profess. Make the life fit the profession. And so, too, when the leading Israelites were carried captive to Assyria and Assyrian soldiers took their lands in Samaria and idolatry mingled with the Jewish religion, it was written: "So these nations feared the Lord, and served their graven images." Hence the Jewish hatred of the Samaritans, and the Lord's words to the Samaritan woman: "Ye worship ye know not what."

But let us look more practically at the subject. Laodicea is with us to-day, nor is our own little body outside of its sphere of influence.

The New-Church writings tell us that Laodicea is the church of faith alone. But we have seen that Ephesus is the church which tends to exalt truth above love, and faith in truth above charity. We have also seen that Thyatira is the church dominated by the world. How does the faith alone of Ephesus and the worldliness of Thyatira differ from these qualities in Laodicea?

The faith alone of Ephesus, as we have also seen, means the emphasis of orthodoxy, or the supremacy of the intellect in the church. But Laodicea's faith alone is not so much a belief in dogma as a reliance upon religious forms, sentiments, emotions, traditions, habits, especially when these things are dominated by a selfish fear of punishment or hope of reward hereafter. All men know that death is coming. All men have, if not a belief in, at least a suspicion or a superstition or a fear of a hereafter. The same selfishness which leads one to lay up

treasure here will also lead him to lay up treasure there. The kind of belief in the other world which makes one religious in form and speech and emotion while his heart is in this world and its selfishness is only "other worldliness," and is a distinct form of faith alone.

This form of faith alone, instead of being zealous, like Ephesus, for orthodoxy or for revealed truth, is likely to be tolerant, indeed, extremely so, but especially where the assumption of a strong position would interfere with worldly success. The prayer, "Thy will be done on earth as in heaven" does not appeal to the Laodicean. The promise of a coming time when the tabernacle of God shall dwell with men awakens in him hardly a sentiment of pleasure. The Hague tribunal fails to appeal to him if arbitration or the abolition of war threatens to interfere with his ambitions. He refuses to consider new legislation which looks to the common good, if such legislation threatens his own special privileges. His religious faith is not a religion of life and love, but of self.

Laodicea's worldliness, too, differs from that of Thyatira, as its faith alone from that of Ephesus. Thyatira's form of worldliness, as we have seen, is illustrated by the change which took place in the church after the conversion of the Emperor Constantine. Then the spirit of the world entered and the love of wealth and power, affecting not so much the great masses in the church as its civil and spiritual leaders. Thyatira's worldliness is especially that which attends upon ecclesiasticism, while Laodicea's is that which affects the masses of the laity. And this spells Protestantism, if we may regard the subject in historical light. As Laodicea is the last mentioned of the churches, so Protestantism was the last development of the first Christian dispensation. It was largely negative, as its name implies — a protest against ecclesiasticism. Is it not true that a large part of its success resulted from a worldly demand, namely, that the privileges of the few shall become the right of the many? While it contained an element of spirituality there are strong evidences that its chief force was political.

While it gave to the world an open Bible, it brought no new spiritual interpretation. It established no new foundations, but so exalted the element of faith alone, or of God's omnipotent power, as to result logically in Calvin's thought, that God does what He will, that man is wholly impotent; and from this it was but a step to the academic conclusion that religion has no vital connection with conduct. Faith must be preserved, worship kept up, the Bible read, prayer must be unceasing, but religion as a life of obedience to God's commandments was never incorporated in the fundamental basis of Protestantism, although accepted instinctively by multitudes. Good people remained, both leaders and laity, who were better than their creeds, but as far as the foundations of faith were concerned, the door was open wide to the world and to the religion of faith alone, in both the Ephesian and Laodicean sense. In the freedom and democracy of extreme Protestantism, with its lack of symbolic forms and its lack of power to win the affections of the young by appeals to the senses and systematic religious culture, the Laodicean spirit finds its most congenial soil.

We observe the spirit of Laodicea, in various forms, in the church of to-day. Among the successful men of our age, who are professedly religious, it assumes the form of an indifference to the common welfare; a failure to seek for a method by which the kingdom of heaven may rule on earth; sometimes an active opposition to all efforts which threaten personal and selfish supremacy. The problem, of course, is perplexing at best; and many proposed remedies are recognized as unwise or foolish; but the real man of God in the church will not cease to seek and to work for the common good.

Again, the Laodicean spirit is seen in the tendency to secularize the church; to make it a kind of social club; a place of amusement rather than the house of God. And closely allied to this is the disposition, unconscious with many, to draw a line of distinction between class and class, to stop at worldly and outside appearances instead of keeping the spiritual element in view and making the desire to know and follow the Master the

test of church fellowship. The tendency of the man of affairs to adopt a double code, one for religious sentiment and another for practical business, is manifested in the disposition of the less prominent to stop at worldly distinctions or outward appearances, at dress or manner of speech or other trifling personal matters, and forget the human soul, which is seeking sympathy and help and perhaps seeking the truth and through the truth the life of the Lord's kingdom. Why is the Protestant Church divided into social grades? Why is the working man so seldom found in the churches, outside of the Salvation Army? It was not so in the early Christian days when master and slave sat side by side at the communion table, when both acknowledged their spiritual poverty and need, and none proclaimed or felt that he was rich, increased with goods, and in need of nothing, and where all felt a common spiritual need and found it supplied in the one Lord and Saviour.

Another form of Laodiceanism is a practical indifference to the grand foundations of the Christian faith. It is one thing to reject the old falsities, but another thing to be blind or indifferent to the underlying truth itself. The truth is the raiment of which the Lord says, "I counsel thee to buy of me white raiment, that thou mayest be clothed." The Laodicean does not acknowledge his nakedness. He thinks he is amply clothed. He needs to buy from the Lord. None else can supply the white raiment of the heavenly kingdom. Man cannot create the truth, nor discover it; it must be revealed.

But it is revealed. And while many are not ready for it, many more are. What are we doing for them? One scientist declares that if people could really and intelligently believe in a life after death, the world would be transformed. What are we doing to help? We have a positive faith in that other world. The books are free, ready to hand; they need cost nothing. Teachers are ready to explain them. We need a real interest in others. We, too, need an intelligent, living, loving grasp of the things we profess to believe. Says a recent writer: —

I have no favor for hazy, nebulous thinking on great Christian verities. A church will be strong and robust in proportion as it throws its own mind into the things it believes, and is faithful and bold in its avowal of them.

Let us, then, banish from our own hearts the Laodicean spirit of worldliness and pride and indifference, seeking for clearer thought, deeper love, and purer life. The age is worldly; a great wave of materialism is passing over, bringing with it a sense of religious indifference or weakness or doubt. But the Lord's love is awaiting a human response. He stands at the door and knocks. If we hear and open the door, He will come in and sup with us and we with Him.

I cannot close without at least an allusion to the possible deeper meaning of Laodicea, mentioned in the discourse on the sixth church, that is, the Church of Philadelphia. It was to the effect that as the Church of Philadelphia answered to the creation of the sixth day, told of in Genesis, so Laodicea, in a deeper view, might stand for the creation, or the rest, of the seventh day, that is, the celestial, as distinguished from the spiritual church, or the church of love, as distinguished from the church of truth. At some future time the relation of the seven churches to the seven days of creation may be a useful theme, but now I will only mention two signs of the possible celestial meaning of Laodicea. The message begins: "Thus saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God." The celestial church, or the church of the heart, was the first and best church of the world. It will also be the last. It was the beginning of God's creation. It will also be the Amen, or the ending. Moreover, the message ends with the promise of the entrance of the Lord into the heart of the Laodicean who overcomes. "I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me." The Church of Laodicea is symbolically represented by the communion cup of the Last Supper, the holiest act of worship — the Lord's own celestial loving presence, the partaking of His very flesh and blood. The last may become the first. He to whom much is forgiven will love much. He who can overcome the lowest forms of evil may

rise to the highest place in the kingdom. They who come out of great tribulation are they who serve God in His temple night and day. This is only a hint of what sometime we may see more clearly revealed.

But as the final word upon the seven churches, let us set before us the one phrase common to all the messages: "To him that overcometh."

And this: "In the world ye shall have tribulation; but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world."

JOHN GODDARD.

THE BIBLICAL AND BABYLONIAN VERSIONS OF CREATION.

THE past few decades have furnished immense activity for the philological and historical sciences. The recent excavations on the hills of Babylonia brought and still bring to the eyes of the astonished world remnants of languages hitherto unknown; a whole literature written on simple clay tablets reveals to the reader the customs, the political history, the legal restitutions, and religious views of a people the existence of which has, in the past, been hidden under a thick veil.

Among all these documents we find in the grand library of Assurbanipal, the last great Assyrian king, who reigned from 668 to 624 B.C., narratives similar to those known to us from the first chapters of Genesis.

This was not the first time that such parallel stories of Genesis were found; in fact, we meet them, especially that of the flood, in India, Persia, Greece, even in America; and, in single tribes, even in Africa, such as the Madai. And still the discovery of those few tablets caused a great commotion in the minds of the whole world, of the laity as well as of the scientists, especially since the subject was brought before the public by Friedrich Delitzsch in his lectures given at Berlin. The reason of this was that it was believed that the solution to the problem of the origin of those mysterious narratives of early Genesis had been finally found. Ever since that discovery the Assyriologists on the one hand and theologians on the other have never had rest from the excitement caused by the continually increasing material and the attempts to harmonize the newly gained with the old knowledge.

The question at issue has not been so much to establish the origin of these narratives, or "myths," as they are commonly called, as the nature of the relation of those contained in the Bible and those of the cuneiform inscriptions.

The story of creation is contained in a large epic; it is written in the Assyrian language on five tablets, in poetical form, and contains over five hundred verses or lines, of which over three hundred are preserved complete.

Before we learn their contents and compare them with the analogous account in the Bible, we will briefly recapitulate the latter in order to get the different points clearly before our mind.

The first chapter of Genesis tells us, in its literal sense, of the creation as effected in six days. The account of the first day tells of the creation of light and of the previous state of the earth. "In beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was void and empty, and darkness was upon the faces of the abyss." Note especially the word "abyss." The Hebrew equivalent is *te hom*, which we meet again in the Babylonian account under the form *Tihamat;* the word means the roaring deep, the agitated chaos, coming from the verb *hūm*, an onomatopoetic word meaning "to roar," "to be noisy," in tumult and confusion. This *te hom*, or abyss, as Swedenborg translates it, is covered with darkness; the act of the first day, therefore, is the creation of light and the distinction between day and night.

On the second day an expanse is formed to distinguish between the waters above and those below the same. On the third day the waters are collected into seas, and the dry ground appears and is clothed with herbs and trees. On the fourth day the Lord creates the two great luminaries and the stars. The fifth brings forth the water animals and birds. On the sixth day the beasts of the land are created and finally man, who is to rule over all of them.

Compare with the above the Babylonian version. The form of it is poetical, as is the ancient literature of most peoples, except the Bible. It begins:—

Of old, when above
Beneath, the earth
While yet the ocean, the primeval,
The primeval source, Tihamat,
Their waters in one
Then appeared
the heaven was unnamed,
bore not any name,
their begetter,
mother of them all,
mingled together,
the first of the gods.

Luhmu and Lahamu, Anshar and Kishar, and Anu are first named; what follows is wanting; it treats probably of the origination of the other gods, the higher as well as the lower. When the story goes on, we meet Tihamat in excited conversation with Apsu, her husband; they want to overthrow the threatening rule of the higher gods; Tihamat wants to rule herself; we remember that Tihamat is the same as *te hom*, the roaring abyss, in the Bible, but personified in the Babylonian epic as the enemy of the higher gods.

A war against the gods is planned. Anshar, the foremost god, whose duty it is to take up the eventual war, is perplexed; none dares to approach Tihamat, who, in preparation for her war, creates eleven horrible beings over whom she puts as a leader her husband. Finally Marduk, the god of light, the grandson of Anshar, offers himself to go to war against Tihamat and her hosts. The gods come together and in great counsel decide that Marduk should be made the highest god if he successfully delivers them out of the terrible danger:—

Since thou, O Marduk!
We grant thee the dominion
Sit thou in council,
Thy weapon victorious,
Of him, lord, who trusts thee,
But the god who plans evil,
our avenger wilt be,
over the whole of all things!
be thy word the foremost;
smiting the foe!
spare thou the life;
pour thou his life forth!

Marduk now armed with bow and quiver, scimitar and trident set out in his war chariot drawn by fiery steeds to fight with Tihamat:—

Tihamat, the mother of deep,
Added irresistible fighters,
With pointed teeth
With poison as with blood
Furious adders
Their body may prance,
She then brought forth a viper,
A mighty storm, a raging day,
Violent tempests,
Bore arms, not sparing,
the creator of all things,
created serpents gigantic,
not sparing attack,
she filled their body.
she clothed with horror, . . .
their breast be irresistible.
a furious serpent, a Lahamu
men armed with scorpions.
fishmen and rams
without fear of war. . . .

Then follows a description of animals of whose horrible appearance we cannot form an idea above all serpents. Against all these, Marduk, the god of light, rides alone with his mighty weapons. At his sight the husband of Tihamat and leader of all her hosts becomes benumbed and after him his allies:—

But Tihamat stands, not turning her neck,
On lascivious lips rebellion. . . .

Marduk turns right toward her, and, after having reproached her with all the wrong she has done, challenges:—

Come forth! I and thou will fight with each other!

The fight now begins; Marduk is victor; by means of his net, his winds, and the darts, he catches and destroys her, hews up her vitals, cuts her heart to pieces. Then, standing on her dead body, he makes captive all her allies together with her husband who endeavored to save his life by flight, robs him of the plates of destiny and puts them to his own breast. Then he returns to the corpse of Tihamat, dashes her head to pieces, and cuts her body into two parts:—

The one half took he, thereof made the firmament,
Bounds set he to it, watchers he placed there,
To hold back the waters commanded he them.

The heaven thus formed he builds into a palace of the gods and creates the stars, sun, moon, and the other planets, determines the course of the stars and the twelve months. With a grand glorification of Marduk on the part of all the gods, in which each god transfers some or all of his honors to the great deliverer, and in which fifty names are bestowed on him, the epic closes. The part which we expect to contain the account of the creation of the plants, animals, and man is as yet wanting, but we possess several fragments which, however, do not seem to stand in any connection with the epic. One, consisting of ten incomplete lines, speaks of the creation of all living, and mentions three kinds of animals — cattle of the field, beasts of the field, and worms of the field.

Another fragment contains in thirty-eight lines an enumeration of all things of which the composer can possibly think — men, gods, demons, animals of the dry land, plants, woods, the Tigris and Euphrates, brick buildings, Babylon, and the other cities.

The last fragment is a parallel account of the struggle between Marduk and Tihamat. Here men are created already and are pictured as suffering under the rule of Tihamat: —

The cities sighed — the men did groan
Lamenting — were men and wailing
To their complaint — there was no help,
No aid came — to their mourning.
Who *is* that great — dragon?
Tihamat is — the great dragon!

Of this fragment the greater part, picturing the fight with the dragon, is wanting; we possess only the introduction and the very end from which it appears that the dragon was killed.

The great epic as far as we possess it treats, as we see, only of the abyss, of its defeat through Marduk, the god of light, and of the creation of the expanse between the waters; for that the division of the abyss' body into two parts and the destination of one as heaven is only the Babylonian version of the creation of the Bible's expanse on the second day is quite evident when we read the Scriptural account: "And God said: Let there be an expanse in the midst of the waters, and let it divide between the waters in the waters. And God made the expanse, and divided between the waters which were under the expanse, and between the waters which were above the expanse: and it was so. And God called the expanse heaven."

Still more strongly than in the epic of creation, the similarity of the Genesis and the Babylonian account will strike us in the story of the flood. The Noah of the Babylonian flood is Sitnapisti, who reports the whole story to Gilgamesh, a descendant of his. The gods, following the urging of Bel, had decided in their council to destroy the men and all life on earth by a flood Ea, the God of wisdom, consents to this, but secretly warns his

favorite, Sit-napisti, a man of the Babylonian city Surippak, commands him to build a boat hurriedly and instructs him how:—

Thou man of Surippak, son of Ubaratutu,
Construct a house, build a boat,
Desert thy possession, think of thy life,
Leave back thy goods, and save thy life!

Sit-napisti obeys the god at once, and with many particulars the way he did do so is told. When the people asked him what he was doing, he answered: "Bel hates me; I shall, therefore, leave Surippak and ride down to the ocean to live with Ea, my lord." The time of the flood comes; he enters the boat with all his family, the steersman Buzur-Bel, with animals of all kind and gold and silver. Six days and six nights the flood goes on; on the seventh it rests; the boat stands on the mount Nizir. Sit-napisti sends out a dove which returns, because there was no place as yet to rest; he then sends a swallow which returns for the same reason; a raven that is sent last does not return; Sit-napisti, therefore, leaves the boat and with much care prepares a sacrifice. The gods are attracted by it and approach, only Bel is angry at the sight of the boat; Ea, however, calms him and advises him not to send any flood any more that destroys all living things at once, but rather to punish the wicked alone, by lions, leopards, famine, and pest. Bel is reconciled, descends and personally blesses Sit-napisti and his wife, who, after this, live together at the mouth of the rivers in eternal youth.

In view of these striking resemblances, we have at once to acknowledge that the stories as told in the first chapters of Genesis and on the clay tablets in Babylonia are intimately related to each other as to contents. This fact was recognized at once, and the problem of their relation has occupied the minds not only of the Assyriologists and theologians to an eminent degree, but also that of the whole Christian world.

Three possibilities had to be considered:—

1. That the Babylonians borrowed their accounts from the Israelites.

2. That both of the accounts may have a common primitive semitic source.

3. That the Israelites may have taken their story of creation from the Babylonians.

The first supposition, that the Babylonians borrowed their account of creation from the Israelites, is for historical reasons most improbable and may be at once dismissed. The Babylonians were a well-cultured people long before the Israelites existed as a nation; we think here above all of the Assyrian ruler Hammurabi, who reigned about 2100 B.C., the time of Abraham, in whose history he figures as Amraphel. Many copies of letters, deeds, bills, and decrees, etc., throw much light on the character of culture and of his legislation. The Assyrian language seems to have been spoken down as far as Egypt in 2000 B.C., while Israel left Egypt as a newly formed nation five hundred years later, about 1500 B.C. A carrying over of those stories from Israel to Babylonia is, therefore, though not impossible, very improbable, especially in view of the fact that the stories up to Abraham do not possess any typically Jewish character.

The theologians, therefore, went on to consider the second possibility — that both accounts may be traceable to one common primitive semitic "myth." But even this seemed improbable to them, especially in regard to the story of the flood. Professor Zimmern (Leipzig) speaks of it in the following way:—

> This theory deserves more serious consideration, as the possibility of the existence of some common stock of myths among the earliest Semites cannot be rejected offhand. Excluded however it is, since certain features of the story are inexplicable from the Israelite standpoint, while finding a highly probable parentage in Babylonian ideas. It follows, therefore, that we have to deal rather with a myth, borrowed in later times from the Babylonians by the Israelites, or, in other words, that their myth was indigenous to Babylonia, but in Israel an exotic.

With these words the second possibility is simply passed by, and that not only by this writer, but by almost all the writers on the subject, who seem all intensely interested in attributing

as much of the ancient and modern culture and literature as possible to the Babylonians.

The third alternative is the most popular with the critics. Not only are most of the contents of Genesis attributed to the activity of the Babylonian mind, but also a number of typically Israelitish institutions and conceptions, as the idea of angels of the other world and the Sabbath law.

One specific argument brought forward is that the idea of the *te hom*, the original abyss as water, and again the idea of a flood of water as covering the whole earth, could not have arisen in a country as dry as Palestine, but only in a country like the lower parts of Euphrates and Tigris and a people near the ocean. But why the dwelling place of the earliest Semites should be restricted to the mountains of Palestine, we are not told. Thus the possibility that the Babylonian epic is not the original version is not refuted. A further argument, moreover, intended to prove the priority of the Babylonian account from its poetical rendering proves rather the contrary. For before an enthusiastic poet uses a legend as his material for a large epic, this legend has, in its essential features, lived a long time in the mind of the people as oral tradition and this naturally in prose.

An example of this is the story of the paradise as it lives with the Madai, a tribe in Africa. This tribe has no written literature, but these stories have been faithfully told by the fathers to their sons for several thousand years, and this in simple prose. As soon as a great poet collects those myths and transforms them into a grand epic, then, of course, the oral tradition looses itself and the nation joyfully accepts this ideal rendering of their myths. Examples of this are the Iliad and the Odyssey, the oldest monuments of Greek literature, and the Nibelungen as that of the German literature.

If, therefore, two parallel pieces of literature like the Babylonian epic and the Bible account of creation in Genesis i. are to be compared as to their age, then the poetical rendering, with all its details worked out, will necessarily be seen to be the secondary achievement. Examined in regard to style, therefore, the Bible account of creation proves to be the older one of the two.

A further question arising from the assumption that the account of the Babylonians is the older one and that the Israelites took theirs over from them will be: When did such an adoption take place and how was the change in the content of the story effected? As to the time of this transition, there is much variety of opinion; some believe it to have taken place when the Israelites entered Canaan, others at the time of King Ahaz (750 B.C.), who was so friendly with the eastern nations; and others go so far as to appoint the *exile* as the time of this appropriation, not remembering that just at this time the Jews had a stronger consciousness of their distinctive religion than ever, and would not have adopted a myth of the heathen, their oppressors, and put it at the beginning of their Bible. More than all, the style of all the first eleven chapters of Genesis is too old and solemn for any such late date.

And the other question which we meet, if we hold the priority of the Babylonian epic, is: How was that epic changed into Genesis i.? This question, like the other difficult ones, is rather passed by than answered by the commentators. The differences of religious conception are obvious to anyone who compares the two. There we have a gross polytheism and dualism mixed together; in the Bible we have a sublime monotheism, the creation of everything by the Word of God. This difficulty is superficially answered by all the leading theologians and Assyriologists with such a platitude as: —

> The material of tradition has in the Old Testament been plunged into the sphere of moral monotheism, and has, in this bath, been cleaned from the religiously and morally confused and confusing elements. (Prof. Sam. Oettli.)

A more detailed and explanatory solution of the question has not been given, and it would be difficult, indeed, if not impossible, to establish such a detailed explanation.

Thus, we have not come to any definite conclusion; for, in the first place, the priority of the Babylonian epic as to time has been assumed without sufficient ground; the theory that both accounts are traceable to a common original has been rejected

without reason; and the difficulties hence arising, the questions: When and how did the Israelites appropriate those stories, have scarcely been touched or are almost totally passed by.

We need not to be astonished at those results; they are the necessary consequence of the darkness, the ignorance in which men are in regard to the true nature of the Word as a whole and of the first eleven chapters of Genesis in particular. The doctrines of the New Church throw abundant light on the subject; in fact, if they are applied properly, all the difficulties disappear and the relation of the two accounts of creation, as well as the existence of all those other parallel stories, becomes quite clear.

To start with, we have to go back to Swedenborg's teaching that there was before the Jewish Church an Ancient or Noahtic Church and a Most Ancient or Adamic Church. These churches possessed the knowledge of correspondences, that is, in natural things they saw spiritual things. The whole Word is written in correspondences, and thus also those chapters of Genesis which treat of the stories of creation, paradise, the flood, etc., with that difference, however, that early Genesis is not historically true, but the rest of the Word is. Genesis i. is not intended to give an account of creation of our earth, but treats of the regeneration of man. It is the creation of the spiritual from the natural man. The six days or times are so many successive states of the regeneration of man, and the emptiness and the darkness on the faces of the abyss picture the state of man before regeneration, and all the other details of the story are by correspondences shown to picture the details of the regenerative process.

Now, the Ancient Church was spread over many countries, and, consequently: —

> The science of correspondences was not only known, but was also much cultivated in many kingdoms of Asia, especially in the Land of Canaan, in Egypt, Assyria, Chaldea, Syria, Arabia, and also in Tyre, Sidon, and Nineveh; it was carried also over from places on the seacoast into Greece; but there it was turned into fabulous stories, as is evident from the earliest writers of that country. (Doctrine of Sacred Scripture, 21.)

So we see that this church and with it the science of correspondences pervaded all Babylonia and Assyria, for Nineveh was a centre of Babylonian culture. This wide spreading of the Ancient Church accounts for the many traces we find in those different countries of stories which we find in the first eleven chapters of Genesis, which, as we know, were copied from the ancient Word that is now lost. And this, therefore, also accounts for the Babylonian remnants of those stories. This, and no other, was the origin of the Babylonian epic of creation, of the Gilgamesh-epic, and the other fragments preserved.

But the compilers of the Babylonian epic of creation do not now include the religious conceptions of the Word. We find them replaced by a gross polytheism and dualism. There are two parties of gods — the good gods, Marduk at their head; and the evil gods, at their head Tihamat. How could such a change take place?

The answer we find in our doctrines: —

> The ancients, possessing a knowledge of correspondences, made for themselves images that corresponded to heavenly things, and delighted in them, because they signified things such as belong to heaven, and, therefore, to the church. They, therefore, set them not only in their temples, but also in their houses, not to be worshipped, but to call to remembrance the heavenly things they signified. . . . But when in process of time the representative things of the church, which were correspondences, were converted into things idolatrous and also into magic, then of the Lord's Divine providence the knowledge of correspondences was gradually blotted out of remembrance, and among the Israelites and Jewish people was altogether lost and annihilated. . . . When the knowledge of correspondences had thus been lost, their descendants began to worship as holy, and at last as deities, the images and emblems set up by the ancients, because they stood in and about their temples. (*Ibid.*, 23.)

When this knowledge was being lost, the true nature and relation of spiritual things became indistinct, and it is here that fancy begins to take its part; different forms of goodness and of wisdom are being personified, and thus the gods arise; this process was the origin of all the different polytheisms in the

different nations. We find an example of this even in the theology of the Christian Church where three different aspects of the one God are often regarded as three different personalities and saints are being worshipped. But in Babylonia we find a dualism at the same time; opposed to the greater gods is Tihamat and her subgods. In such a state of mind, the true meaning of Scripture also became obscure; fancy built here, too, emphasizing and adorning with detail, pictures that pleased the popular mind.

It was in this state of mind that the Babylonian epic of creation was composed, and we can, in its general features, follow the results and discover here and there a remainder of the knowledge of the true meaning of the story. Note in this connection the fight described in the Babylonian story, between Marduk and Tihamat. It will be clear as soon as we read the explanation Swedenborg gives of the *te hom*, the abyss: —

> The faces of the abyss are the lusts of the unregenerate man, and the falsities thence originating, of which he consists, and in which he is totally immersed. (*Ibid.*, 18.)

This reminds us exactly of the description of those horrible serpents and scorpions which, in the Babylonian story, Tihamat is described as creating for her war against the gods. At the same time we remember that it is just the serpents which correspond to the natural lusts, and in reading the internal sense, as Swedenborg gives it, we get a clear view of just the way in which the matter appeared to the men of the Ancient Church; for that account of Tihamat's fight and her helpers is a true correspondential picture of the fight of our natural loves against the spiritual ones, especially in temptation. A most striking passage in the explanation of Swedenborg is the last phrase: "Thus the old man must needs die before the new man can be conceived." We carry the idea not too far perhaps if we think here of the defeat and death of the personified abyss, the Hebrew *te hom* or the Babylonian *Tihamat*.

A further example for the same thought is the person of Marduk. In the second and third verses of Genesis i. we find the

darkness on the faces of the abyss and the creation of light which immediately follows in contrast. In the Babylonian version it is the god of darkness who is to fight Tihamat; that light which was created in the original account becomes the personified light, the Babylonian god of light, Marduk, and we see here again the popular fancy at work.

Another interesting point in connection with Marduk is that he is the son of Ea, the god of wisdom. Light, we know, corresponds to wisdom, and in the spiritual world wisdom is seen as light. We see, therefore, in this relation of Marduk, the god of light, to his father Ea, the god of wisdom, another instance of true correspondence, of which probably those who wrote were originally conscious.

Still another point, tending to show that even when the people of the later Ancient Church were writing the story of creation down in poetry they had kept some of its true meaning, is this: that in the second (Babylonian) fragment of the fight of Tihamat manhood is regarded as existing already. Tihamat has not to be killed first in order that by means of her body the natural earth may be created and later on men on the same, but Tihamat lives with men and they are pictured as suffering under her rule, as the record reads: —

The cities sighed — the men did groan
Lamenting — were men and wailing
To their complaint — there was no help,
No aid came — to their moaning.'
Who *is* that great — dragon?
Tihamat is — the great dragon!

The true idea that Tihamat, the abyss, is living with men in their natural loves and makes them feel unhappy and that she must be subdued seems still to have prevailed before the personification was made complete. This truer idea of her existence had to give way, however, later on to the idea of mere material existence, of her material body that was divided and from which our earth was created.

The last typically Babylonian addition is in the mention of the

luminaries. While in the Word the simple mention is made that the one should rule by day, the other by night, the Babylonian author could not help adding some evidences of his knowledge of astronomy; he determines exactly where the moon is to stand in the relation to the sun at different times of the day, month, and year, mentions the position of Jupiter, and other points. Astronomy was, as we all know, the science in which Babylon excelled all other countries during many centuries. A particular list, however, of astronomical data betrays late composition, and we can clearly see here again how the original Bible account was the basis of the Babylonian, but was adorned with the later knowledge.

And, lastly, the mention of brick buildings and of the different Babylonian cities in another fragment of creation seems to force us to put the time origin of the record at a very late date.

We have, therefore, found abundant evidence of the priority of the Biblical accounts; priority in time as well as in regard to qualitative contents; and we can trustfully await the further excavations and discoveries, feeling sure they will all prove the divine character of the holy Word and its sublime superiority to all other writings.

Adolph L. Goerwitz.

THE RELATION OF THE CHURCH TO CIVIL AFFAIRS.

"Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæsar, or not?" was a question which the Pharisees once asked of our Lord. His answer showed that it was lawful, and not only lawful, but a duty. Such, at least, has been the common understanding throughout the Christian centuries. The saying, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's," has been rightly supposed to mean that the civil government under which men live has its just claim upon them. For the protection which it affords and for the varied services which it performs it is entitled to their tribute and obedience. Cæsar stands for the civil authority. His image and superscription on the coin of the realm are the token of that authority and of the allegiance which is owed to it. Without the imperial stamp the money would lose its chief value. It makes no difference whether Cæsar be a beneficent ruler or not: his power must be recognized. For the civil government is essential to the true order of human life.

The Apostle Paul sets forth the same doctrine. In his epistle to the Romans he writes: —

> Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. . . . Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour.

Elsewhere his language is: —

> Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work.

Peter likewise writes: —

> Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king as supreme; or unto governors as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evildoers, and for the praise of them that do well.

This teaching is oft repeated in the writings of the New Church, with clear and explicit statements of the rational grounds on which it rests. Government in external and worldly matters is a necessity for men. If they are to live together in peace and amity, if they are to found towns and cities, or to enjoy the blessings of a common country, they must have a recognized system of laws, and rulers to administer them. Those who make, who interpret, and who execute the laws must be, as far as possible, men adapted to their work. The places which they fill in the community call for special qualifications which are peculiarly their own. It is, indeed, desirable that they should be spiritual-minded and religious men. Other things being equal, such men are to be preferred. But it does not follow that, because they are such, they will be good magistrates, jurists, or legislators. Efficiency and usefulness in these capacities may often exist without any church associations or any professions of belief in heavenly and divine things.

The case is the same with these as with other human functions. The chief demand which we make on our grocer or butcher is that he shall understand his business and give just weight and measure. Of our tailor or shoemaker we ask only that he shall be proficient in his trade and honest in his dealings. We are glad to have a physician who avowedly believes in the Lord and His Word, but we *must* have one who possesses medical skill and knowledge. So with our civil rulers. Whatever other qualities they lack, they need to be endowed with practical wisdom in the administration of affairs, with tact, with common sense, with patience — in short, with the various faculties and attainments which go to make up statesmanship. It is not every man who can successfully govern a nation or a community. For this reason it has often happened that the purest and most upright citizens, being without the proper nature and training, have proved lamentable failures when called to high office.

Interesting and instructive statements on the subject may be quoted as follows: —

There are two things appertaining to men, which need to be in order, namely, the things which are of heaven and the things which are of the world. Those things which are of heaven are called ecclesiastical, those which are of the world are called civil. Order cannot be maintained in the world without governors who are to observe all things which are done according to order and which are done contrary to order; and who are to reward those who live according to order, and to punish those who live contrary to order. If this be not effected, the human race must perish; for by heredity the desire of ruling over others and of possessing the goods of others is connate with every one, whence arise enmities, envyings, hatreds, revenges, deceits, cruelties, and many other evils; wherefore unless men be kept in restraint by the laws and by rewards suited to their loves, which are honors and gains for those who do good, and by punishments contrary to their loves, which are the losses of honors, of possessions, and of life, for those who do evils, the human race would perish. It is expedient therefore that there be governors to keep associations of men in order, and that these governors be skilled in the knowledge of the law, full of wisdom and of the fear of God. (Arcana Cœlestia, 10789–10792.)

Thus the need of civil government and its distinctness from ecclesiastical or spiritual government are clearly shown. They are not mere fortuitous circumstances, but exist in the very nature of things, extending, as we are taught, even into the future life. For we read elsewhere that there are governments in heaven, differing from each other, as the various societies or communities of angels differ. Likewise church and state are there distinct, each having its own functionaries.

That civil life, with all that pertains to it, stands in a class by itself, plainly appears in many passages. For example: —

Truths are of three kinds. They are civil, moral, and spiritual. Civil truths relate to those things which are of judgment and which are of government in kingdoms, in general to what is just and equitable there; moral truths relate to the things of every man's life in regard to companionships and social relations, in general to what is sincere and right, and specifically to virtues of every kind; but spiritual truths relate to the things of heaven and the church; in general to the good of love and the truth of faith. There are three degrees of life with every man. The rational faculty is opened to the first degree by civil truths, to the second degree by moral truths, and to the third degree by spiritual truths. (Heaven and Hell, 468.)

To the same effect we read in the "Doctrine of Life": —

There are civil good, moral good, and spiritual good. Civil good is that which a man does from the civil law. . . . Moral good is that which a man does from the law of reason. . . . Spiritual good is that which a man does from spiritual law. (12.)

But we need not multiply quotations. The teaching is sufficiently plain. Enough has been said to show that civil life is one thing, spiritual life another, and moral life intermediate between them. Each belongs to its own plane and must be developed in its own way.

Hence it follows that a man may be active and efficient in civil affairs without possessing any spirituality. Or he may have a keen moral sense and yet be destitute of spiritual knowledge. Avowed belief in the Lord and His Word may have found no place in his consciousness. On the other hand, one who is truly spiritual cannot be unmindful of his moral and civil obligations. To love God and to do His will necessarily implies the endeavor to observe the rules of morality and good citizenship. Nor can those rules be fully and genuinely kept, except from a spiritual purpose. They may be perceived by the understanding, but they are not acknowledged with the whole heart until they are seen to be divine. No principles of life can be called sure and lasting in their influence on any man before they are established on this basis. Nevertheless, there are those who on the moral and civil planes are worthy of high honor, but who cannot yet be classed as spiritual men. They may be on the way to become such, or they may not. If they are not, they will certainly go backwards and gradually lose their clear perception of what is good in moral and civil life. Is it not true that all of us must serve, as it were, an apprenticeship on these lower planes before the higher one can be opened and developed? The purposely immoral man can never become an angel. The unfaithful citizen of an earthly country will never prove himself a worthy subject of the kingdom of God. Thus it is that the three degrees of human life are bound indissolubly together.

But our special interest is in the relation which these different

planes of thought and action bear to each other. Particularly let us consider the question, What has the church to do with civil affairs?

The first and most obvious answer to this question, as drawn from the foregoing statements, is that she has much to do with them. It is no small part of her duty to exert an influence in favor of good citizenship. She should never cease to present love of country as one of the foremost of religious obligations. Her definite teaching is that the country is a larger neighbor to be loved as one's self. Not to impress this teaching on her members is to be faithless to her trust. The essence of true charity, as we know, is to perform with fidelity the duties of one's calling, whatever they may be. By this means, more than by any other, a man makes himself useful to the common body, that is, to the country and community in which he lives. Without service of this kind he would be but an idler, and a burden on society. But there are other obligations which he owes. There are public as well as private debts which are due from him. In time of war, for instance, we ought all of us to be ready, if need exists, to lay down our lives for our country. Listen to this strong and striking passage from "The True Christian Religion": —

> That one's country should be loved, not as a man loves himself, but more than himself, is a law inscribed on the human heart. Whence is promulgated this, which is professed by every just man, that, if its ruin is threatened by an enemy or by anything whatever, it is honorable to die for it, and glorious for a soldier to shed his blood for it. This is said because it is to be loved so much. (414.)

But not in war alone is love of country to be exercised. There is equal occasion for it in times of peace. Indeed, the day never dawns when it may not in some manner or degree be called for. We have no right, as members of the New Church, to be mere passive spectators of what goes on in the nation, state, city, or town, of which we form a part. These greater neighbors rightly demand our loyal service, and it is the duty of the church to urge our rendering it. So far as the church performs that

duty, and her influence is felt throughout the community, corrupt officials will never be tolerated, and purity and patriotism will prevail in high places; every good citizen will do his utmost to prevent the nomination or election of unsuitable men, and will lift up his voice against all abuses of public and corporate power.

Consider, briefly, one simple way in which almost anyone can, if he will, exhibit his love of country. It is suggested by the following passage, which like the previous one, is found in "The True Christian Religion": —

> The public obligations of charity are especially duties and taxes. . . . Those who are spiritual pay them with one disposition of heart, and those who are merely natural with another. The spiritual pay them from good will, because they are collected for the preservation of their country, and for the protection of it and the church, and for services performed by officers and rulers, to whom salaries and wages are to be paid from the public treasury. Wherefore those to whom their country and also the church are the neighbor, pay them voluntarily and cheerfully, and esteem it iniquity to deceive and defraud. But those to whom their country and their church are not the neighbor, pay them unwillingly and reluctantly, and, whenever opportunity is given, they defraud and cheat; for with them their own house and their own flesh is the neighbor. (430.)

How many are there among ourselves, to say nothing of the world at large, who love their country so dearly that they gladly pay their full share of taxes for her support? How many travellers, returning to their native shores from foreign lands, take pleasure in rendering, for the same reason, a just account of their dutiable merchandise? It is a matter of common knowledge that evasion and deception in these respects are considered allowable by men who would scorn them in private transactions. Patriotism of such a prosaic and self-denying sort as this has no place in their hearts. The only teaching which the church, if true to her mission, can give on the subject is: Be honest, upright, and faithful in all the relations of life; love your neighbors of every degree as much as, or more than, yourself; obey the laws, whether you approve of them or not; be ready to sacrifice your own ease and pleasure when

your country demands your time, money, and services; if dishonest or inefficient men are chosen to office, see that it be through no neglect or connivance of yours; this I say to you in the name of Him whom we worship; it is His revealed will and law.

The church bears the same relation to all civil affairs whatever. Her part is to inculcate, as from above, from the eternal God Himself, the principles which they must apply to every duty that confronts them on the plane of citizenship. "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's" should be her unceasing command. We have no more right to disregard those things than any others. There are the poor within our gates who need to be fed and clothed. We must do our part in feeding and clothing them. There are the ignorant who need to be instructed. Shall we not join with our fellow citizens in upholding the cause of education? Every kind of misery and disorder, shall we not hold ourselves ready to participate, according to our ability, in all worthy and reasonable efforts to palliate or remove it? There can be no doubt on these points. As men and women of the church — for the very reason that we believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and His teachings — we should endeavor to fulfil all civic obligations. No one can be a genuine New-Churchman without being, in the true sense of the term, a public-spirited citizen. This does not mean that one must needs be a prominent personage or possess a wide influence. But it does mean that he is sincerely interested in matters which concern the general welfare and helpful in dealing with them to the full extent of his capacity and opportunity.

Thus the church bears to the state, or to civil affairs, a positive relation, which she must not overlook or ignore. She must, like the spiritual mother she was designed to be, declare to her children and impress upon them the duty of activity and righteousness in civil life. But here her work ceases. It is not incumbent on her to usurp, in any degree, civic functions. She may properly urge the importance of exercising the right of suffrage as wisely and conscientiously as possible; but she goes

beyond her province if she attempts to prescribe the particular policy or candidate which shall be favored. Those who speak from her pulpits have no better knowledge than other men as to the comparative merits of free trade and protection, or of this and that aspirant for office. These matters belong to a wholly different plane from that with which the church has to deal. Wisdom and good judgment concerning them pertain to a different set of faculties from those which take cognizance of heavenly and divine truth. The church very properly does not tell us what ticket we must vote on election day. She is neither Republican, Democratic, nor Socialist. She should know her limitations and be content with teaching the eternal principles of justice, honor, and patriotism, leaving it to each one who hears her voice to make his own application. The consequence is that those who agree in religion may be, and generally are, more or less divided in politics. Yet this does not harm their spiritual relations or make the church a less powerful and helpful influence.

As it is in the political field, so is it with all social and economic problems. The church as such has nothing to do with them except to set forth from the Word, according to her doctrines, the principles by which they should be solved. Not so with her members as individuals. They have their duties to perform as citizens. In that capacity they must not only try to consider every question in the light of her truth, but must acquaint themselves with the facts of the case and with the lessons of human experience. This kind of knowledge she cannot give. It is outside of her sphere of operations. It can be gained only by inquiry and observation on the more external or civil plane of life and by the use of faculties which are acute and active on that plane.

Take, for example, the perennial subject of intemperance. The church should not hesitate to emphasize the need of temperance in eating and drinking as a means of spiritual growth and development. But when the question arises as to the best way of making men temperate or of overcoming the evils of

intemperance, she has nothing to say. Divine revelation is silent on this point. It is a matter which must be decided by the state, not by the church. If every citizen were a church-member, there would still be different opinions as to whether the absolute prohibition or some restriction of liquor-selling were the wiser policy. Men would be equally honest and equally loyal to the church whichever view they held.

Likewise, the care of the poor and unfortunate is not in itself a church function. It is an obligation which rests alike on all the members of the community. The church, so far as there is occasion, should present it, in unequivocal terms, as a religious duty; but it is not for her to prescribe the methods of its performance. These, again, must be learned for the most part by observation and experience. Each particular case must be dealt with on its own merits, according to the existing facts and by the exercise of a judgment which is not necessarily spiritual. In common with those to whom, as much as to himself, pertains the relief of this class of sufferers, the churchman may work as intelligently and efficiently, or even more so, than he would if his efforts were confined to the narrow limits of his own ecclesiastical body. But, however this may be, there can be no doubt that the work itself is of a civil and not of a spiritual nature, affecting, primarily, the bodily condition and not the soul's welfare. There is much that is intermediate between the church and the slums, though the people of the church and the people of the slums should not have an inch of separation between them.

Thus we might keep on idefinitely with our illustrations. It is natural for those who love the church to think that she must have among her teachings specific remedies for all the moral, civil, and even physical disorders of society. Such persons are apt to feel troubled or displeased, because she does not as an organization embrace every theory and participate in every movement which they favor for the reform or betterment of mankind. The single tax may be the best economic measure which was ever devised and may be in harmony with spiritual

truth. But the fact, nevertheless, remains indisputable that it is not that truth and cannot be maintained on ecclesiastical authority. Many of us have been acquainted with those who claimed that homœopathy was a system of medicine sanctioned by New-Church doctrines, and perhaps it is. But no New-Churchman is to be blamed if he fails to accept this notion as a part of his religious belief. Others there are who think that the law of influx, or the relation of the spirit to the body, covers the whole ground of healing. But they cannot justly complain of their brethren who hold that the body, on its lower plane, has its own distinct needs and is subject to its own separate laws, which must be observed quite independently of the influence of the spirit upon it, however fully that influence be recognized. Human slavery was a monstrous evil which cursed this country fifty years ago. As such it was rightly to be denounced by the church. But mere denunciation would effect nothing. Before the evil could be removed, other voices than hers must be heard, other hands than hers must be called into action. Practical questions on the plane of civil life must be considered. Shall the work be done quickly or gradually? Shall it be done by violent or gentle means? In what way will the interests of all be most perfectly conserved? Are there no vested rights to be taken account of, no ties of mutual dependence between master and slave, which must not be too rudely broken? In short, there were thousands of details which had to be dealt with before the great burden which had been fastened on the nation through the fault of no man living could be lifted. The settlement of these questions demanded far more than the vague longing to be freed from undesirable conditions; it called for those qualifications so often already referred to — an accurate knowledge of the circumstances, tact, prudence, judgment, and discretion in dealing with them. The problem was, indeed, a mighty one, too great for man to solve. Only Divine Providence could solve it through a series of events, which human wisdom could never have pre-arranged or foreseen.

Let us, then, recognize the three degrees of life — the spiri-

tual, the moral, and the civil — each in its place, and let us not confound them with each other. To lay upon the church the functions of the state or upon the state the functions of the church is to do an injury to both. It is no less a duty to render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's than it is to render unto God the things that are God's. Yet, while we take note of the distinctions, we must not forget that the several degrees are inter-related. They were designed to act and re-act on each other, constituting together a complete whole. If it is the part of the church to refrain from the exercise of civil functions, she must all the more faithfully remember her own mission. She must diligently learn and teach the truth which is of God, revealed by Him through His Word, and lead her children to walk by its light in the way of eternal life. She must never cease to proclaim the glad tidings of the Lord's advent and to publish His salvation. Above all other voices with which the earth resounds must hers be heard, saying, in the language of the ancient prophet: —

> He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth Jehovah require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?

JAMES REED.

MENTAL HEALING.

THAT states of mind have much to do with causing and with curing diseased conditions of the body is a well-known fact. It is not a new thought. But the wide-spread and constantly increasing interest in it, which has marked the period in which we are living, the growing importance which is attached to it by regular physicians, and the endeavor in many directions to establish and apply it practically to the prevention and cure of diseases on a rational and scientific basis, are new.

Most valuable help is to be found in the writings of the New Church. Indeed, it is easy to believe that what is taught there has occasioned this modern movement. For all the fundamental principles of it and the essential philosophy are set forth in what has been written by Emanuel Swedenborg as the servant of the Lord Jesus Christ in His second coming.

First is given the truth that "the spiritual world is the world of causes and the natural world is the world of effects" (Divine Love and Wisdom, 134). Under this divine law of creation and of existence, health and disease have a spiritual origin. Indeed, every physical ill has its cause in a corresponding spiritual disorder. It is a logical inference, therefore, that if the cause can be removed the effect will cease to exist, and thus a cure will be established. This is the starting point of every system of mental and divine healing, and it was given to men through the writings of Swedenborg as an instrument in the Lord's hands.

In order that he might learn and teach these things among many others, Swedenborg had actual experiences of these relations of cause and effect, to which he refers a number of times, as, for instance, in the following: —

> There exhaled a troublesome heat, which was collected from various hells, arising from lusts of various kinds, as from haughtiness, lasciviousness, adulteries, hatreds, revenges, quarrels, and fightings, whence arose in the hells that heat which exhaled. When this heat acted upon my body,

it instantly induced disease like that of a burning fever; but when it ceased to flow in, the disease instantly ceased. When man falls into such disease, which he has contracted from his life, then immediately an unclean sphere corresponding to the disease adjoins itself, and is present as the fomenting cause. That I might know for certain that this is the case, there were spirits from several hells with me, by whom was communicated the sphere of the exhalations thence, and as that sphere was permitted to act upon the solid parts of the body, I was seized with heaviness, with pain, yea, with disease, corresponding thereto, which ceased in a moment, as those spirits were expelled; and lest any room should be left for doubt, this was repeated a thousand times. (Arcana Cœlestia, 5715.)

Now notice first of all that these spiritual diseases flowed directly into his body in such a way as to produce there the corresponding natural diseases, without flowing into his soul or mind as a spiritual disease for him at all. This is important as showing that the essential cause of bodily diseases is not in the mind to which that body belongs, as is generally supposed by modern schools of mental healing. Hence sick people are not morally responsible for their diseases; if they were, sinners would always be ill and saints would always be well; and human freedom would be lost, for no one could do wrong nor think falsity without immediately suffering physical harm as a result, and he could not proceed far in evil courses without meeting an early end in physical death. Fear and suffering and certain death would paralyze spiritual freedom. No one could be prepared for the state of his free choice in heaven or in hell. Hence the Lord —

Maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth His rain on the just and on the unjust. (Matt. v. 45.)

In other words, He has created two worlds entirely distinct from each other, one for the soul to live in and the other for the body — so distinct that they exist from two separate suns, with two distinct sets of atmospheres through which their forces radiate and continually vibrate (Divine Love and Wisdom, Parts II., III.). Hence the mind acts in the light and heat and by the forces of one, the spiritual sun; and the body in the light and heat and by the forces of the other, the natural sun. Hence

there are spiritual laws or ways of life for the soul; and there are natural laws or ways of life for the body. Obedience to the former gives the soul harmony with its environment, or spiritual health; and obedience to the latter gives the body harmony with its environment, or physical health. Therefore saints and sinners are alike benefited by the shining of the sun of earth, and may share together the blessings or the curses of natural law. And a healthy body has power from the sun and atmospheres and the vibrating forces and elements of this world to act alike in doing the will of either saint or sinner, or to act alike for each of us in obedience to both our evil and our good desires, so giving us alike evil and good pleasures; and the pleasures, so far as the bodily senses and perceptions are concerned, are alike in evil indulgences and in good activities. Modifications of this, however, will appear later on in this article.

Thus the activities and faculties of the body are given and maintained by what is designated in the New Church as common or general influx. To fully understand this, we must understand the doctrine of the *Maximus Homo* or Grand Man, which briefly is that God, the Creator, dwells inmostly in the human race and forms them into one great humanity in His own image and likeness. His heart beats with infinite love and life within humanity's heart giving pulsations and life to it; His lungs breathe with infinite wisdom and power within humanity's lungs giving respiration and power. And so in every particular it is true that in Him humanity lives and moves and has its being. Every vibration of mind and body of humanity is in correspondence with the divine vibrations of love and wisdom, life and power.

So each of us lives and moves and has his being from the Lord in this *Maximus Homo*, Humanity. The mind could not love nor think isolated without the common influx of love and thought from the *Maximus Homo;* it must be in association with all other human minds in the spiritual world. And in the same way the body could not live and move without the common influx of life and faculties from the *Maximus Homo*. The

brain is organized and maintained by this common influx from the brain of the *Maximus Homo*. The eye is formed and enabled to see by this correspondence or relation of cause and effect with the eye of the *Maximus Homo*. And so of every organ, viscus, and member of the earthly body, even to every minutest cell which lives and acts in its respective place in the body, it lives and acts by common influx from the corresponding organ, viscus, member, or cell of the Grand Man. (Heaven and Hell, 87–102; 418.)

Thus the health of the body is constantly flowing down or out from the Lord through all the heavens in this common or general way in divine and heavenly order, and disturbances of it arise from some opposing and disturbing general influx. This comes, as we have seen, from the hells, or those in the spiritual world whose hearts beat in opposition to the Lord's pure love of others and whose lungs breathe in opposition to the wisdom of this love. They also are organized into one greater humanity, or deformed *Maximus Homo*, by their common and complete perversion of the heavenly form of love and wisdom. The image and likeness of the Lord is turned into a monster of deformities and disease. As life flows from the Lord through the heavenly human to form and fill the body with health, so it flows through the perverted human of the hells to destroy health. So long as the common influx of heaven prevails there is physical order, health. But reception is determined by that which receives. "All power is in ultimates," to use a New-Church expression. There may be disorders in the body which shut out the influx of heaven and admit the influx of hell. The basis of power is in the body. Hence Swedenborg's experiences of disease; "a thousand times," as he says, to teach him that it always comes by influx from the hells. Hence saints and sinners alike have it by this common influx of the hells, when disorders in the body permit. Hence even the body of our Lord by crucifixion became the receptacle of the torments of hell and of death. (Heaven and Hell, 100, 207.)

Thus, bodily conditions are the basis of health and disease,

in common with all material conditions as a basis of earthly blessings or hardships. Sunshine, rain, and good soil are required as a basis for receiving bread from heaven in earthly harvests; and neglect of cultivation may even then lead to a reception of thorns and thistles and poisonous plants from hell instead. These material conditions in a large measure may be beyond human control. Parching drought may diminish or destructive tempests may lay waste the farmer's crops; and so conditions may exist under divine permission which make the body less receptive of health; the seasons of the year and of different years may not be equally salubrious; or through accidents so called or the carelessness or even malicious assaults of others or through physical inheritance, we may suffer harm which shuts out the influx of heaven and permits that of hell. (*Ibid.*, 569.)

But without some such condition occasioned in the body as a basis of reception, Swedenborg teaches that the influx of hell cannot enter to cause disease. We read: —

> All the infernals induce disease, but with a difference, by reason that all the hells are in the lusts and concupiscences of evil, consequently against those things which are of heaven, wherefore they act upon (or into) man, from what is opposite: heaven, which is the grand man, contains all things in connection and safety; hell, because it is in the opposite, destroys and rends all things asunder; consequently if the infernals are applied, they induce diseases, and at length death. But it is not permitted them to flow in even into the solid parts themselves of the body, or into the parts which constitute the viscera, the organs and the members of man, but only into the lusts and falsities; only when man falls into disease [contracted from his life (Arcana Cœlestia, 5715, cited above)] they then flow in into such unclean things as pertain to the disease; for, as was said, nothing ever exists with man, unless there be a cause also in the spiritual world; the natural with man, if it were separated from the spiritual, would be separated from all cause of existence, thus also from everything of life. (Arcana Cœlestia, 5713.)

This is where the use of medicines which produce physical and chemical changes in the body, and surgery with its mechanical alterations, come in successfully. When bones are broken, by placing the fragments in right relations to each other the gen-

eral influx from heaven is enabled to heal them more perfectly; when sepsis begins in the body, as in appendicitis, the removal of putrid parts and the use of antiseptics shut out the general influx of hell and open the way of return for the general influx of heaven. So an alkali will neutralize acidity of the stomach and shut out the infernal influx there. But these are very external remedies. If the claims of homœopathy are true it operates more interiorly, but in a similar manner.

There is something, however, which operates still more interiorly, and that is the mind. But let us never lose sight of the fact that even the mind must operate by the law of correspondence or influx upon the body as other than itself, and that its operations must extend even into the solid parts of the body and effect changes there to determine general influx; for there is the basis and ultimate of power to receive the influx of health or disease.*

To illustrate, let us consider the effect of fear upon the heart and lungs. As we have seen, they exist and do their work by general influx from the heart and lungs of the Grand Man, the heavens, actuated by the heart and lungs, or the infinite love and wisdom of the Lord.

Fear upsets the equilibrium of the body, the flow of electric currents is disturbed as the galvanometer shows in psychological laboratories; the nervous system is weakened and trembles; the heart and the lungs contract; less air-cell work is done in the lungs; less carbon dioxide comes out of the blood, less oxygen goes in; the circulation of the blood is impeded — too much or too little goes to various parts of the body — toxins are generated in the tissues, still further devitalizing the blood for body-building, and by the law of bacterial reproduction there is a rapid increase and fermentation of animalcules in the system, which are believed to be injurious and certainly indicate a

* This paper does not discuss "particular influx," partly for the sake of brevity, and partly because Swedenborg teaches that "the corporeals [things of the body] are exempt from the particular influx of spirits and angels, and are ruled by general influx." (Arcana Cœlestia, 5990; 5862, 6192, 6211.)

decaying condition. Thus the way is open for an assault of disease from the hells upon the weakest constitutional point. Hence the common perception that the way to get a disease is to fear it, and the way to escape it is not to be afraid.

The first mental medicine, therefore, to be administered to every patient by every doctor, of no matter what school, is the removal of fear and the restoration of courage and trust. There can be no better medicine than that given by the Lord in the Psalms, saying: —

> Wait on the Lord: be of good courage, and He shall strengthen thine heart. (xxvii. 14; xxxi. 24.)

The same may be said of all evil emotions — hurry, worry, impatience, dread, regret, remorse, despondency, jealousy, envy, covetousness, fault-finding, hatred, anger, and impurity — they all act upon the body in such a way as to diminish its capacity for influx of health from heaven and open it to influx of disease from hell. It is said that the emotion of hate is the most injurious of all. Chemical tests have been made of persons in cheerful, peaceful states of mind and no poisons found in them; similar tests of the same persons while angry, or just after, revealed alkaloid poisons. It has been said that the toxins generated in one hour of hate, if taken into the system, would kill eighty men. It has also been said, in connection with such experiments in practical psychology, that if a person could hate intensely and steadily for one hour exhaustion or death must put an end to the process. (Spinney's Health Through Self-Control, pp. 49 *et seq.*)

Thus we see that the mind may have more to do with the health and disease of the body than external circumstances and conditions; and that it may be more potent than the *materia medica* in effecting a cure; although this is no hindrance to the employment of such things, as Swedenborg says, "for the Divine Providence concurs with such means." (Arcana Cœlestia, 5713.)

But Swedenborg teaches of still more interior action of the

soul upon the body. In considering it let us not lose sight of the distinctness and separateness of the action of each. For the soul acts upon the body as another, and the body re-acts to the soul by virtue of its own power derived from the sun of this world and of general influx from the heavens. Swedenborg says: —

> The soul and the body are distinct, but reciprocally united; the soul acts in the body and into the body, but not through the body, but the body acts of itself from the soul. (True Christian Religion, 154; cf. Arcana Cœlestia, 2004.)

He shows how this relation of action and re-action between the soul and the body, extending as it does to the minutest particulars of each, is given and maintained by a direct influx of life from the Lord Himself into the inmost organisms of the soul, which constitutes the individuality and the personality of each and every one of us (Heaven and Hell, 37, 38, 208, 296, 297). In this man differs from animals, which, not having it, are governed by general influx only (Arcana Cœlestia, 1633, 3646). But man by virtue of it has rationality and freedom in the image and likeness of God to govern himself in spiritual things; and while his body is governed by general influx in what are called the involuntary things, as in the beating of the heart, the breathing of the lungs, digestion, assimilation, and even in walking, talking, *et cetera*, when they have become matters of unconscious action or habit, nevertheless in all voluntary activities the soul, the mind, the man himself governs. Then the body still acts of itself, but from and in obedience to him. This relation is more intimate than that between a horse and its rider, or between master and servant, to which it is sometimes likened, for it is so vital that it extends to the minutest processes of the bodily organism, even to those which exist and are governed by general influx; for if the soul is separated from the body and ceases to act upon its particulars, every re-action of the body stops, the heart ceases to beat, the lungs to breathe, the stomach and intestines to digest; all the organs and viscera, in short, cease to be receptive of general influx from the heavens and

death results. Such is the dependence of the body upon its vital connection with the soul, not at any one point only, as in the brain or heart, but throughout its whole structure. And this dependence exists from the moment of conception, so that while general influx builds the body according to the order of the Grand Man, it does so for the soul, by re-actions to the soul's action at every instant and in every particular. Hence the poet uttered the truth, saying: —

> For of the soule the bodie forme doth take;
> For soule is forme, and doth the bodie make.
>
> — SPENSER.

This formative power of the soul received directly from the Lord underlies all the states of the body in health and disease. Its origin is in the divine health, wholeness, and holiness of the Lord. If man had kept it holy and whole and healthy in his soul, no disease or disorder could ever have entered his body. We read: —

> Hence it is that evil closes the smallest and quite invisible vessels, of which the next greater ones, which are also invisible, are composed; for the smallest and quite invisible vessels are continued from man's interiors: hence the first and inmost obstruction, and hence the first and inmost vitiation in the blood: this vitiation, when it increases, causes disease, and at last death. But if man had lived the life of good, his interiors would be open into heaven, and through heaven to the Lord, thus also the smallest and invisible little vessels would be open; whence man would be without disease, and would only decrease to ultimate old age, until he became altogether an infant, but a wise infant; and when the body could no longer minister to its internal man, or spirit, he would pass without disease out of his terrestrial body into a body such as the angels have, thus out of the world immediately into heaven. (Arcana Cœlestia, 5726.)

But man may be saved from all this by the Redeemer if he turns to Him for regeneration. Not only may he find healing for his spiritual diseases, but the small and invisible vessels of the body, closed by birth into an evil heredity, may be opened again, and the vital fluids may be restored and the blood purified. Swedenborg shows that the interiors both of the mind and the body of angels are turned to the Lord as a sun, because the mind

rules the body. And he teaches that this is true also of men who are regenerated, because the interiors of the mind act as one with the interiors of the body, and the exteriors of the mind with the exteriors of the body. We read: —

> This conversion to the Lord is an actual conversion; it is a kind of elevation. For the man is elevated into the heat and light of heaven, which occurs as a result of opening the interiors; and when these are opened, love and wisdom flow into the interiors of the mind, and the heat and light of heaven into the interiors of the body. Hence the elevation; which is, as it were, from mist into air. (Divine Love and Wisdom, 138; see 135–143.)

We read further: —

> That the blood of the heart purifies itself of undigested matters in the lungs, and also nourishes itself with profitable matters out of the air breathed in, is evident from much experience. . . . That the blood in the lungs purifies and nourishes itself correspondently to the affections of the mind is not known hitherto, but it is very well known in the spiritual world; for the angels who are in the heavens are delighted only with the odors which correspond to the love of their wisdom; but the spirits in hell are delighted only with odors which correspond to a love opposed to wisdom; these odors are stenches, but those are perfumes. That men in the world impregnate their blood with similar things according to correspondence with the affections of their love, follows of consequence; for what the spirit of a man loves, his blood according to correspondence craves, and attracts [draws in] by respiration. (*Ibid.*, 420.)
>
> The blood may abound in uncleanness, and yet be not distinguishable from clean blood. And the respiration of a merely natural man appears similar to the respiration of a spiritual man. . . . With the spiritual man it is the purer blood, called by some the animal spirit, which is purified; and that is purified in proportion as the man is in the marriage of love and wisdom. (*Ibid.*, 423.)

In the last number of his work on "The Divine Love and Wisdom," Swedenborg shows how the brain coverings are composed of threefold cells, so that the finest in an orderly state pour their fluids into the less fine, and they in turn pour theirs into the relatively coarse. By heredity the two finer sets of cells are closed and the coarse is filled with impurity. But he teaches that these finer cells may in turn be opened by regeneration, and when they are opened and discharge their fluids the impurities of the brain and nervous system shall be purged away.

So our bodies, which by evil heredity are interiorly corrupt and prone to disease, because closed to the Lord, may be opened from inmosts to outmosts to His redeeming and saving influences now present in His own glorified Divine Human. So He may heal us of all our diseases, cast out every influx of the hells from both mind and body, not by miracles, but by spiritual and natural processes none the less wonderful because rationally and scientifically understood. It is the same Lord, with the same divine power, Who of old stretched out His hands of infinite love and mercy to open the eyes of the blind, the ears of the deaf, and to heal all manner of diseases, and to lift up the children of men, to protect and bless them.

When these things begin to be practically realized in the New Church, as they must be ere long, a closer daily walk with the Lord will follow and a more constant looking to Him for physical as well as spiritual health, and mental means will be rationally employed for the prevention and cure of diseases. It will be Divine healing indeed, both from without and from within.

H. Clinton Hay.

SOME ASPECTS OF MENTAL HEALING.

In the study of mental healing there are three things we wish to know: —

First: What are the facts about it?
Second: What is the explanation of it?
Third: What is the religion of it?

These are its natural, rational and spiritual aspects. To a brief consideration of these is this paper devoted.

First, some facts about mental healing. Mental healing as an art is not new. It is as old as humanity. It is the modern exploitation of it and the effort to establish it upon a scientific foundation that is new. And in this respect the practice of mind-cure marks an epoch in human development.

In the application of the art, mental healing, somewhat paradoxically, has made use of various material agencies — especially did it do so before the real nature of the curative force was recognized — such as amulets about the neck, a potato or buckeye in the pocket, a cord or strap about the wrist, medicines from loathsome objects or animals, anointings, sham medicines of colored water or bread pills, water from some revered well, contact with sacred relics, etc., all of which seem to have achieved authentic cures, though evidently through no virtue in the material means, but solely as the result of faith in its power and the consequent influence on the imagination of the patient.

Distinctly mental agencies in the art of healing include faith in a great personage or healer, the word of a man of God, the inspiration of a great sermon, rational argument and conversation with a patient, denial of the reality and power of disease and of evil in general, hypnotic suggestion, meditation on God, the prayer of faith, and so on; in which the mind of another acts upon the patient directly, and also indirectly through an effort to arouse the patient to cooperate in his own cure.

The history of such cures shows that they are not peculiar to any race, nation, class, religion, sect, or ism; that mental healing is effective within the church and outside of it, among Christians, theists, atheists, and idolaters; that the tenets of no cult are necessary to it, and that the beliefs of all cults may be successfully employed.

The range of bodily effects induced by mental states is considerable. Authentic cures of insanity, nervous prostrations, melancholia, dyspepsia, fevers, bruises, abnormal growths, deformities, and skin diseases are recorded. Wonderful chemical changes in the secretions of the body are being discovered. Professor Elmer Gates, of the Psychological Laboratory of Washington, D. C., has shown that the breath of an angry person is so laden with subtle and powerful poisons as to be literally murderous. The inoculation of animals with these products of respiration has produced death. Professor Gates says: —

> Enough poison would be eliminated in one hour of intense hate to cause the death of fourscore persons, as these ptomaines are the deadliest known to science.

On the other hand, the earnest thought of engaging in gymnastic movements seems so potent in building up muscular tissue, that President Hall, of Clark University, suggests that a right course of thinking might develop muscle as well as a right course of exercise.

And, finally, analysis of the conditions attending cures show that a man may cure himself or may be cured by another. That other may be present or absent and his patient awake or asleep, credulous or incredulous, and may be man, woman, or child.

Such, briefly, are some of the facts underlying the subject of healing the body by mental forces. By what philosophy are they to be accounted for?

Both health and disease are phenomena of life. Life is the divine love and wisdom which descend by influx into the organic spiritual receptacles of will and understanding that compose the mind of man and through these into the cerebellum and cere-

brum of the brain, thence into the heart and lungs, and so impart life and movement to the entire body. The disturbance of this influx is the cause of all mental and physical disorders. In the mind such disorder is called evil and sin; in the body, sickness and disease; and the one corresponds to the other.

Used in this broad sense as comprehending all mental life, "mind," in accordance with a prevalent belief, is the fountain of all health; but as corrupted and perverted by man is the origin of all disease.

And in the same sense, all healing of the body, whether by right thinking or by the administration of medicines, is alike mind healing. For every physical state is first a mental state. All life which moves in the body descends chiefly through the soul, so that the curative influence of drugs, the nourishing power of food, are effects of mind action. Apart from the soul or mind, the body is a corpse, incapable of manifesting either health or disease and unable to respond to either faith or physic.

But when we use the word mind in a limited sense, as is frequently done, to mean conscious thought, the situation is changed. In this sense "mind" is not the origin of all diseases, nor the only means of cure. On this restricted basis of mind as the conscious volitional mind we justly distinguish two causes of disease, the one physical and the other mental, and, consequently, two classes of healing agents, the one material and the other spiritual; and just as fairly do we insist that this distinction shall not be slurred over.

In this way we shall avoid a great error common to the popular treatment of healing by mental methods. There is an ambiguous use of the word mind. Men say that all physical states are the result of mind states, which is undoubtedly true; and then making mind states synonymous with mind's conscious processes, as if all influx were through conscious controllable states, which is palpably false, proceed to invest thought with well nigh omnipotent power over the body as a consequence. The New-Church philosophy corrects this by showing what common-sense experience abundantly proves—that thought

is only one mode of mental life and by no means its most potent one. Emotions are more powerful than thoughts, and the unconscious, subconscious, or involuntary life of greater range and influence than the conscious, volitional life.

Conscious thought is the field of auto-suggestion, which includes the application to self of faith, prayer, imagination, etc., as healing agencies. It is the place where the soul's disorders come to the attention to be voluntarily harbored or rejected. Hereditary evils, which constitute tendencies to disease, lie in the subconscious life. They may or may not come into the sphere of conscious life. So far as they do, man may remove them and in time correct the hereditary tendency, thus giving to auto-suggestion or right thinking important curative powers. Regeneration always requires the conscious cooperation of man and regeneration is certainly favorable to a healthy body. But in so far as the mind works in unconscious ways, right thinking can accomplish nothing directly.

In order, therefore, to see the healing art in its right relations, the limited field of voluntary influence over disease must be recognized. The psychological laboratory has much to say about the power of thought to attract the blood to any part of the body and to stimulate the functions or alter the secretions of its organs. The truth of this should not be doubted. But over against this fact, let us put another, that a dash of ice water will draw more blood to that particular region in one minute than can conscious thought in a whole day. A mind action produces the physical re-action to cold water, but it is not a voluntary or a conscious mind activity, since no willing or thinking can prevent it, and it is equally effective in a state of unconsciousness.

This single fact brings to the front that whole field of bodily re-actions to material agencies, which give rise to what may truly be called material or natural causes of disease, which mental healers are prone to overlook. Fire burns us, water drowns us, poisons slay us, a blow on the head renders us unconscious, pressure on the brain causes paralysis or insanity. Im-

proper food produces inflammations, headache, and various distempers. If cold water can cause a violent action of heart and lungs without conscious thought and in spite of it, what may not wet feet, cold rooms, strong draughts be able to achieve in the way of congestions, fevers, and other disordered conditions? And where shall we stop? What is true of one material agent is true of all. Thus there is an urgent demand for hygiene and scientific *materia medica* to supplement right thinking in the prevention and cure of physical maladies.

Wrong thinking may, in many instances, create a disease of its own, or perpetuate one already in existence; in such cases the restoration of the mind restores the body. Conscious mental states may and do aid or hinder both the contraction and the cure of diseases from physical sources. Yet the mind cannot fully cure what it has not caused, so that until the material ultimate or basis is corrected by physical means, the mental state may be powerless to effect a desired cure.

Indeed, to carry the matter one step further, the power of the conscious mind to return to a healthy state and to remain in it may be removed by externally induced diseases. The body itself, by virtue of its re-action to external agencies, may produce disordered feeling and thinking. Indigestion makes men cross. Homœopathy prescribes material remedies for purely mind symptoms. Swedenborg recognizes this principle when he says that man cannot be reformed in sickness, as his mind is not in a sound state. The mind itself may be disordered and enslaved by physically induced disease; were it not so, reformation in sickness, instead of being impossible, would be just the thing necessary to restore the mind and heal the body, and hence beneficent and obligatory.

Again, it seems probable that in all cases of healing by auto-suggestion or right thinking, the feelings are more potent than the mere form of the thought. The New Church teaches that love, not thought, is the life of man, that all the power of thought is from affection, and that as is the quality of one's feelings or emotions such is his real spiritual and mental state. Expe-

rience shows that the conscious states that create disease are the selfish passions and the so-called "morbid" thoughts; or as Swedenborg says:—

> The lusts and passions of the mind, these are the causes of disease. The common origins of disease are intemperance, luxuries of various kinds, pleasures merely corporeal, also envyings, hatreds, revenges, lasciviousness, which destroy a man's interiors, and when these are destroyed the exteriors suffer and draw him into disease and death. (Arcana Cœlestia, 5712.)

Health follows in the train of temperance, mental balance, hope, courage, love, and contentment. And these are emotions. And anything that is capable of exciting these, especially if strongly, whether it be environment, personal spheres, superstitious beliefs, faith in God, or other forms of auto-suggestion, is curative in its nature. Because feelings more than ideas are the healing agents, so much has been achieved by cults whose teachings are fallacious or even perniciously false. A technically erroneous idea is overborne by a powerful and buoyant emotion. Why the denial of the reality of sin, sickness, and death is potent to heal is not that it is true, but because the false philosophy, to him who can believe it, yields freedom from morbid and self-centred feelings.

This fact ought to clear away that unreasonable and actually unhealthy concern about speaking of disease, or thinking about anything gloomy, which is often prevalent in connection with this subject, and if heeded would prevent us from knowing our evils and rejecting them, and would even prohibit the reading of God's Word as tending to produce gloomy thoughts. Experience proves that not the thought of fear, but the feeling of fear increases one's susceptibility to disease. Not the thought about anger and killing, but the destructive emotions themselves alter the secretions of the body and create poisons. Conversations about evil and sickness are not necessarily harmful; it is the sinking down into self-centred and morbid feelings that does injury; and this is quite independent of the topic of conversation or the character of the surroundings. Given hopeful, loving, buoyant emotions and one may think and speak of

disease and misfortune and move amid the worst conditions safely, as far as injurious mental effects on the body are concerned. One of the greatest contradictions of mental therapeutics is that its devotees often stand in the same morbid fear of mental disease germs that some feel for the material kind. Doctors and workers in the slums could hardly exist if thoughts instead of feelings were the destructive forces; but as a matter of fact they are not more sickly than others. The golden rule for auto-suggestion is not so much to cease thinking and speaking of disease and evil as to abandon morbid feelings and passions, turning the attention wholly away from self and the body and living in love, hope, and determination for the right.

That other phase of mental healing in which absent and sleeping patients are cured seems capable of a simple explanation. It is the product of consociation of minds. The New Church from its foundation has recognized the unconscious yet powerful operation of mind on mind. Every soul has an active sphere of its own life constantly enveloping it, which favorably or unfavorably affects all who come within its field. The reality of such influence is now being scientifically recognized in telepathy, hypnotism, animal magnetism, and mental therapeutics. But it is probable, nay, quite certain, that these are only special instances or forms of an unceasing action and reaction of one mind upon another. They only illustrate what we are unconsciously doing all the time. Healthy and unhealthy influences momentarily go out from each one in a mental stream, causing or curing disease, helping or hindering the recovery of the sick. The use of these forces in voluntary practice consists in directing them by will and thought to the point where they are especially needed. But here, as in auto-suggestion, the quality of the affections sent out is more important than the precise form of the thought or the vehemence of the will. The hypnotist cures the tobacco habit, not by mere suggestion to the thought, but by inspiring a loathing of the sight and smell of tobacco. The emotions constitute the spiritual power itself, the thought simply directs the power to the point

where it is to be applied. Both suggestion and auto-suggestion may be operative at the same time in cases of mental healing, and the one may be converted into the other. Mere unconscious spiritual influence or suggestion is not regenerative, but as auto-suggestion it may become so.

In considering unconscious mental influences, we touch on the relation of spirits and angels to disease and health. This does not alter the preceding facts and explanations, but shows their spirit-world aspect.

The divine life is mediated to men through heaven and hell. There is, indeed, a direct and primary influx from the Lord alone into every plane of man's mental and bodily life; but also a mediate and subordinate influx through good and bad spirits, unknown to both parties. On the basis of their distinctive spiritual traits, the inhabitants of the spiritual world are arranged to form one great man. In the same order are the faculties of the individual mind arranged, and also the organs of the physical body. So that every organ has some society of spiritual beings to which it corresponds and by influx from which its functions are governed. In health, the influx is from societies in heaven; in disease the influx is from the societies of hell:—

> When societies operate, they act into those parts and members of the body to which they correspond. The heavenly societies act into them by a gentle, sweet, and delightful influx; and the infernal ones . . . by an ungentle and painful influx. But the influx of them is not perceived except by those who have their interiors open. (*Ibid.*, 5060.)

This influx by spheres according to correspondence with societies in the Grand Man is called general influx and rules in nature, in the animal world, in man's physical body, and originally over his mind as well, but not since the fall. (Heaven and Hell, 296.)

To save man from the complete sway of the hells after his perversion of general influx by his sins, the Lord established a more intimate relation between the human mind and spirits. Not general spheres, but individual spirits, both good and evil, were adjoined to man's will and thought. The divine ordering

of man's affections and ideas by this presence and influence of individual spirits is called particular influx, and, broadly speaking, reigns over the mind only and not over the body:—

> Man cannot live at all from general influx as can animals devoid of reason . . . because everything in his life is contrary to order. If he, being in this state, were actuated solely by general influx, he must necessarily be actuated by the hells. (Arcana Cœlestia, 5993.)
>
> There are at this day very many spirits who want to inflow not only into the thoughts and affections of man but also into his speech and actions, and thus into his bodily things; when yet bodily things are exempt from particular influx of spirits and angels. . . . To inflow into the bodily things of man is to obsess him. (*Ibid.*, 5990.)
>
> The infernals are not permitted to inflow into the solid parts of the body . . . but only into the cupidities and falsities. When a man falls into disease, then only do they inflow into such unclean things as belong to the disease. (*Ibid.*, 5713.)

Physical health, therefore, primarily consists in preserving the externals of mind and body in harmony with the laws of general influx, which on one side are spiritual, but on the other are the laws of nature. (Heaven and Hell, 99.)

Consequently, disease is the result of violating the laws of nature, or, what is the same, the laws of general influx. This may be brought about in two ways, either by external means, such as excessive fatigue, lack of hygiene, physical violence, contagion, dissipation, etc., on the principle that influx accommodates itself to efflux; or by the purely mental way of passion and morbid feeling, in which man, by appropriating the influx of evil spirits, perverts the orderly movement of general influx and conveys the interior vitiations of the mind to "the solid parts of the body."

Evil spirits are always present in disease, for when they are not the direct cause of the malady, they are attracted by its uncleanness as something congenial because correspondent. Hence a physical cure is always a removal of evil spirits from association with man. Mental agencies are adequate to this when the spirit has been the sole cause of the disease, but not if the spirit has been attracted to diseased conditions arising

elsewhere. Swedenborg speaks of fermenting food in the stomach attracting spirits whose presence induces anxiety and moroseness. The indigestion precedes the spirits' presence. In such cases the spirit will depart only with the clearing of the stomach. Thus we have on the basis of influx, as was previously pointed out from science and experience, two distinct yet complemental fields of causes and cures of disease, the one natural, the other spiritual, one operating through matter, the other through the conscious mind.

Thus it is that even the wicked may possess health and physical beauty, while the righteous may have neither. Yet, because the interiors of the mind correspond to and so directly affect the interiors of the body, there will always be this difference, that while the good are growing in immunity to disease, the evil carry with them a perpetual predisposition to its attacks, through the inward closing of body and mind to the Lord and heaven, the fountains of life and vigor.

And this brings us to the religion of mental healing. And here the fact of great significance is that all disease, being directly or indirectly the result of evil, is the violation of divine life and order, so that all restoration to health in the last analysis, whatever the means, is effected solely by the Lord. Whether a man be pagan, atheist, or Christian, his healing is of the Divine providence and by Divine power and consists in bringing back mind and body into obedience to the law of God. This is true whether we look at the cure as the result of rest, hygiene, medicine, mental suggestion, or as the removal of evil spirits. The Lord's permission must be seen in the existence of disease and in its use as a means of spiritual purification, and His providence in the varied means employed for our relief.

There should be the greatest care exercised not to imbibe the false notions which often underlie the practice of mental healing. The notions are not necessary to the cures, hence the cures do not prove the truthfulness of the notions. A cure may be effected in spite of error, but the truth is vastly more effective. Many opinions which affect the health little are

pernicious in their influence on the spiritual life. Whether one lives an orderly life for personal advantage or for the Lord's sake makes little difference to the body, but it is everything to the soul. An evil man secures the benefits of mental forces, not on the principle of Beelzebub, the big devil casting out the little one, but by an *external* compliance with the principles of the Lord's kingdom. There may be an external conjunction of bad spirits with good ones and a similar power gained thereby. On this principle many wicked arts of infernal spirits rest. It is the basis of the so-called "magical miracles"; but there is no religion in it, though there may be physical healing. But by invoking Divine truth and love and building on the basis of true spiritual principles, our healing will be more sure and will convert magical cures into true Divine healing. All things being equal, he who has the truth and whose interiors by obedience and worship are open to the Lord must be the healthiest, and he has what no others can have, not only temporal life, but the life eternal.

So that while there are many things in present-day healing by mind forces that stop short of religion and even subvert it, there is nothing of use in mental healing that is not involved in true religion. I see no spiritual objection to the practice of the art, provided it is done in acknowledgment of the Lord and in the light of New-Church truth. But he who pursues religion faithfully has little need to seek help elsewhere.

So when we ask, What is the religion of mental healing? we can reply as Miss Call does in her admirable book, "The Freedom of Life," religion is the all of it. All that is not religion in it is a misconception of it and a direct hindrance to it. The entire subject is but a commentary on that single principle enunciated by the Lord:—

Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you.

HERBERT C. SMALL.

THE DIVINE NAME.

INSTEAD of the old familiar *Jehovah*, modern books use now almost exclusively the designation *Yahweh*. It is the purpose of this article to treat of the propriety of this change, also to offer some suggestions as to the form and use of the divine names, and to answer some questions which occur to students of our English Bibles arising from the spelling of the names.

I. THE SPELLING AND READING OF JEHOVAH.

It is well known that the old Hebrew which has preserved us the divine name, was written without any vowels. In that writing the sacred name occurs as YHVH. Because it contains four letters it is sometimes called the Tetragrammaton.

When the Semites, led into captivity, were in danger of losing the knowledge even to the pronunciation of their revered tongue, an ingenious system of vowels was invented to aid in the preservation of their mother tongue. That system consists of a series of short lines and dots so placed under, over, or in the bosom of the consonants, that the marks do not touch the sacred letters. Thus they do not defile the divine Word, though they are human additions, and yet they supply the element needed for the reading of the language. Viewing them as a development of the Hebrew language, the added vowels might be regarded as a human definition of the divine text.

There is no record of the precise time when these vowels were added, but whenever it may have been, it seems certain that then the Jews no longer remembered or attempted any pronunciation of the divine name. The endeavor of accounting for the knowledge of the most sacred appellation is handed down in the following tradition: —

Only the high priest uttered that holy name, once a year on the solemn day of atonement, in the holy of holies, where no

other human ear could hear it. The only other occasion when the awful name was audibly sounded was when the high priest, about to die, spoke it into the ear of his successor.

The reason for the secrecy that veiled the enunciation of this name was not a mere external solemnity that clothed the Jewish ceremonials, but the fear of abusing the holy name and incurring the curse following the breaking of the command, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain."* It reduced the use of the divine appellation to having it before the eyes only, upon the written page.

Nevertheless, it induced a dilemma among the followers of YHVH. They were taught from childhood up to read the Word diligently and to teach it. The divine name occurs thousands of times throughout the sacred writings. What could be done with that name when the reader came to it in the text? To pronounce it was to abuse it; to omit it was to leave out of the text the very essence of the writing.

The Massorites settled the difficulty by giving the Tetragrammaton the vowels e, o, a,† the very sound of these vowels suggesting the word *'edonai*,‡ which was always read when the vowels suggested it. In the word YeHoVaH the vowels do not belong to the Tetragrammaton YHVH, and no part of this sacred name is read; but the name 'eDoNaI, from which the vowels come, is substituted *in toto*. Thus YeHoVaH is always read *'edonai*. This word, in grammatical parlance, is called the "perpetual Qeri" for YHVH, and this phrase means that *'edonai* is "perpetually read wherever the text has the four letters YHVH," these four letters being only beheld with the eye, but never pronounced.

*This appears even stronger in LEV. xxiv. 16: "He that blasphemeth the name of the LORD, he shall surely be put to death; all the congregation shall certainly stone him," etc.

†The Italian sound of the vowels is taken for granted. Here *e* has the sound of *e* in *e*volution; *a* as *a* in *a*lms; and *i* as *i* in l*i*p; *o* as *o* in b*o*at.

‡In order to avoid loading this article with niceties that pertain chiefly to the Hebrew language, though contributing nothing to the substance, details which a student of the language will easily supply are here omitted.

The New Testament concurs in the suppression of the divine name YHVH, for it does not even use the name *'edonai* in quotations from the Old Testament where YHVH occurs, it uses the Greek equivalent *Kyrios*. For example, in MATT. xxii. 44, Jesus quotes Ps. cx. 1 as: "The Lord said unto my Lord," etc. Here the Hebrew has: "Said YHVH to *'edonai*," etc., which is in the New Testament Greek: "Said *Kyrios* to my *Kyrios*," from which our translation is: "The Lord said unto my Lord," instead of "YeHoVaH said to my Lord."*

II. CERTAIN VARIATIONS IN THE READING OF JEHOVAH.

In the Hebrew text the sacred name YHVH occurs hundreds of times joined to the next important word by which the Divine was named: This word is *Elohim*. Where the Hebrew reads YHVH-*Elohim* the Hebrew, therefore, according to custom, read *'edonai-Elohim*, translated in our Bibles, "*the LORD God*."

In a number of instances, however, we have the sacred name preceded by *'edonai*, so that the Hebrew reads 'eDoNaI YHVH. It is clear that to read YHVH with the vowels of 'eDoNaI (namely, YeHoVaH) would bring the word *'edonai* twice. This would be a confusion of *the* divine name with another name, and, therefore, would be a breach of the divine commandment. In this case, the Jews read instead of YeHoVaH the other name *Elohim*. This word has the vowels "e, o, i," and these vowels were, therefore, put into the divine name. It appears then under the form YeHoViH, and the two names 'eDoNaI-YeHoViH are read *'edonai 'Elohim*. They are rendered in our Bibles "Lord GOD." (This juxtaposition of *'edonai* and *Elohim* occurs over two hundred times. Three times it is reversed *Elohim 'edonai* — HAB. iii. 19: Ps. cxl. 8 and cxli. 8.)

*Other passages in Matthew are i. 2; ii. 15; iii. 3; iv. 7, 10; v. 33; xxi. 9.

III. ON THE ENGLISH RENDERING OF YHVH.

Although the sacred name proper to the Divine occurs thousands of times in the Hebrew original, it occurs only a very few times in the English Bible, and is there regarded as a proper name. The passages where YHVH is found in English are EXOD. vi. 3: "By my name Jehovah was I not known to" Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Ps. lxxxiii. 18: ISA. xii. 2 and xxvi. 4. (There are also two compound names *Jehovah-jireh*, GEN. xxii. 14, and *Jehovah-nissi*, EXOD. xvii. 15.) In all other places YeHoVaH is translated LORD where it stands alone or is joined with *Elohim*. But in the hundreds of passages where YeHoViH is joined in the original with *'edonai* it is translated GOD (*'edonai* appearing as Lord).*

The early New-Church translators have followed Swedenborg throughout in the rendering of YHVH. Where it is printed YeHoVaH in the common Hebrew (or the so-called Massoretic) text, they have transcribed the name *Jehovah*,† not infrequently all in large capitals. Where the Hebrew has YeHoViH (because connected with *'edonai*) they use uniformly JEHOVIH, large initial with the rest small capitals.

The two names YeHoVaH *Elohim* are rendered JEHOVAH GOD; while *'edonai* YeHoViH are found as LORD JEHOVIH.

The American revisers of the so-called King James' version have adopted the transliteration of the name YeHoVaH as the proper name Jehovah, that is, with capital initial only. YeHoVaH *Elohim* (as in GEN. ii. 4) they render Jehovah God, and *'edonai* YeHoViH (as in GEN. xv. 2) Lord Jehovah. In the latter case they take no note of the different printing in the Massoretic text.

*The word "lord" is the translation of a number of Hebrew words; but it never means the Divine when written in small letters.

†The Carter Bible, Boston, 1869, has uniformly JEHOVAH, large initial and the rest small capitals.

IV. THE MODERN SPELLING YAHWEH.*

Since the Jews never pronounced the name YHVH, it is customary (remembering the restriction at bottom of page 86) to say, that, since the death of the last high priest, Simeon the Just, its true pronunciation has been lost. As the word YeHoVaH (or our anglicized "Jehovah") is the mingling of the consonants in YHVH with the vowels of 'eDoNaI, it was, therefore, never intended to be read. Among those who knew (the Jews) it was never read. But among the Reformers, where the true status of the written *double-word* was either not known or ignored, the pronunciation of YeHoVaH as an ordinary word, with vowels as if its own, was initiated.

Modern scholarship has returned to the original word YHVH, respecting its individuality. They rejected the un-scholarly "Jehovah" and acknowledged the absolute ignorance in which the past leaves us as to any original pronunciation — if ever it had any. The road was, therefore, left clear for any sensible suggestions as to the manner in which a modern age might use the Tetragrammaton. Consequently, the Hebrew learning, which in late centuries has made enormous progress, stepped in to supply the desired word. After considerable discussion, the historical consideration established its weight, and the word YaHWeH or *Yahweh* has come into more and more general use.

The historical basis for this word is to be found in Theodoret and Epiphanius (of the fifth and fourth centuries A. D., respectively), who give the divine name, among others, in Greek as *Iabe.*†

This name is formed in strictly grammatical manner as the causative of the verb HaVaH. The meaning of this causative YaHVeH (as a verb, third singular m) would be: "He who

*Those who wish to make a more extensive study of the subject should consult Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, Volume II., pages 1238–1245 on the name Jehovah.

†But for more detail see the article in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible.

causes to be." The proper noun from this verbal form might be rendered: "The universal Cause."

This suggestion seems very plausible; nevertheless, the name Yahweh is open to several objections. *First*, the suggestion of *Iabe* is from an obscure source, of practically no etymological certainty.

But a far more weighty doubt must come up in the mind of anyone who enters more deeply the line of this suggestion. On considering the causative of the verb HVH, one naturally turns to the Hebrew original for its specific use. Though the verb *to be* is used in Hebrew thousands of times *there is not one causative form* to be found. This would be enough to indicate that the causative of this word is apparently not according to the genius of the Hebrew language.

The difficulties grow when one scrutinizes the meaning of the stem HVH. We remember at the outset that the stem HVH, in the sense of *being*, has all but disappeared from the Hebrew* and is practically preserved only in the Chaldee dialect. The stem HVH has acquired almost exclusively the meaning of *what is calamitous* or *ruinous*. As an interjection (HVI=*hoï*) it means *woe! lamentation!* As a noun (HVVH=*hawwah*) the lexicon renders it *desire* of the wicked, *cupidity;* 2, *fall, ruin; calamity*. It would not be impossible to trace the course by which this stem HVH has acquired its sinister signification, but it should suffice to know that the Hebrew force of *being* has altogether passed into the stem HYH, leaving to HVH this sense of calamity and ruin. Rather than suggesting a *universal cause*, YHVH, or *Yahweh*, means now: "He who causes ruin, or a calamity"—(if the genius of the Hebrew should admit of the causative of this stem).

In order that the reader may not be left in doubt as to the meaning of HVH, there should be given every reference to places where it occurs, and hence they are given. It is rendered *calamity* in Ps. lvii. 1: besides Job vi. 2; xxx. 13: and Prov. xix.

*The only two places where HVH is found are Gen. xxvii. 29 and Isa. xvi. 4, except in the very late books of Eccl. (ii. 22 and xi. 3) and Neh. vi. 6.

13; *wickedness* in Ps. v. 9; lii. 7; lv. 1: besides PROV. x. 3 (margin); *iniquity* in Ps. xciv. 20; *mischief* in Ps. xxxviii. 12; lii. 2: MICAH vii. 3: ISA. xlvii. 11: and EZEK. vii. 26; *noisome* in Ps. xci. 3; *perverse things* in JOB vi. 30; *naughty* (*-ness*) in PROV. xi. 6; xvii. 4.

Whoever has an unbiased linguistic sense, will be guided by the language itself and will put aside his own imaginations, however plausible and pretty they may appear to him. This would be enough to keep anyone from accepting the term *Yahweh*, especially a New-Churchman who recognizes the need of connecting with the term YHVH only the noblest conceptions.

It is to be understood, of course, that modern scholarship does not connect this opposite sense with the name Yahweh, and they are here simply charged with the neglect of having regard for the historic development of the word. Themselves the exponents of strict historical regards, they set aside history whenever a pet theory demands their defence.

But it is not impossible to perceive the deeper reason for the modern substitution of *Yahweh* for the unscholarly *Yehovah*. It is far more than a scholarly rebuke. The term *Yahweh* as *the universal Cause* has undoubtedly commended itself to the modern age, because it relieves the quadriliteral YHVH of an aspect which has always been troublesome to modern thought. The theology of our day is scientifically compelled to acquiesce to the philosophical idea of a First or Universal Cause, while it is unable to acknowledge a *personal God*. The very expression "personal God" seems contradictory to those who conceive under the term God the all-comprehensive as huge in space or time — in other words, to those who object to Spirit as a reality.

It is true that in conceiving the Divine as a Universal Cause, modern theology escapes an immediate materialism, but it only puts off the day of defining that universal cause as either a part of nature itself, or finally recognizing the spiritual plane as the cause of the material. Be that as it may, the present tendency is to make the universal cause chaotic, and in that chaos is

latent either the final merging of what is divine in the human, or inmostly the deifying of man. This modern tendency is the soul of the new version, and the general apathy toward the new version must be ascribed to a perception of this inner tendency.

If there is one thing that is evident from every page of the Hebrew Bible, it is the anthropomorphism, which recognizes the Divine not merely as A man, but as *the sole* and ONLY *Man!* It shows human beings as human only when that which by creation is an image of The MAN becomes through consistent life, according to His thoughts or commandments, a Likeness of Him (though not an identity with Him).

It is for this reason that the New Church is jealous to lose nothing from the divine name Yehovah, but strives to gain a fuller meaning — for the higher this concept is in the church the nobler will human life itself become. But this higher desire cannot be realized by any fancy, it must grow out of hard, rational facts, and for this reason the determination of even such an external thing as the form and sound of the divine name has a deeply significant ground.

V. SUGGESTION AS TO THE FORM OF THE DIVINE NAME.

Some questions are, therefore, pertinent. "Is the true divine name irretrievably lost?" "Is no clue to the original pronunciation left us?"

There are, of course, objections to the very propounding of such questions, which ought to be heard at once. The objections do not come from persons who think it a fruitless enterprise to search for that which has been given up as irretrievably lost, for to most active minds this would be rather a spur to the endeavor of accomplishing actually what at present seems impossible. The objections arise rather from doctrinal grounds: that there is a Divine Providence, at least thinkable, which is concealing from a fallen race the sacred name of divinity, at least until in its manifestation as the redeeming power it had made the name *Jesus* of the divine human the only name

"under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." (Acts iv. 12.)

There is a particular temptation for New-Church people to be content with spiritual ideas and to walk lightly over the steps which belong properly to the realm of matter. But as the letter of the Word is the basis and containant of all the deeper meanings, the determination of the facts becomes very important, indeed of first importance. Hence, instead of being contented in the thought that the Divine Providence has permitted the name to become lost, and thus from an obscurely understood doctrine to make the external form of the divine name of no importance, we ought to remember the warning that the letter of the Word should not be determined from any doctrinal (or even spiritual) consideration. The letter of the Word is fact and must be determined according to laws governing facts.

But how can we approach the facts so long forgotten and buried in the historical uses of the divine name?

First of all we remember that in most ancient times the name was used and even in later times of Semitic history. What can we do to recover the lost treasure? Certainly the proper manner of proceeding is to hunt for the lost jewel in the linguistic ruins of that history. Have we any? Is it not probable that if there were any, scholarship would have brought them to light? Be that as it may, there is one thing sure and that is, we have all a duty to search the Scriptures, because they testify of Him.

A source not hitherto used for all it is worth is in names which early parents gave to their children. Those ancient wise people delighted to add the divine qualities to earthly designations which they wished for their children, and in this they were mindful that the best that they could desire for their children was truly human good when acknowledged as having its source in Him, who alone is MAN. We have, therefore, such names as *Jehoshua* or Joshua (meaning the Lord is Salvation or a Saviour); *John* or in the original *Jehochannan* (meaning Jehovah is gracious); Hezechiah or in the two Hebrew forms *Hizkiyah*

and *Hizkiyahu* (meaning Jah or Jehovah is strength); and many others.

When the people turned more into their own ways they ceased to love to think of the best in them as the Lord's and they had by gentle means to be reminded of the process by which man's own evil must be put away and better things from the Lord be put in their place. That was an age when the Lord changed their names and made out of Abram *Abraham*, or out of Jacob an *Israel*.

But the time came when they no longer desired to know the Lord, and then His name, the very sound of it, was forgotten.

Is this, then, the end? Why surely not! Instead of terminating our thoughts in the forgetfulness which overtook history, let us take those names and look at the facts which they preserve.

First of all we have the form of the divine name in the quadriliteral YHVH.

Next such names as Hezekiah, Elijah, and others are preserved to us in a twofold form, namely, first as Hizkiyahu or Hizki+YaHU, and Eliyahu or Eli+YaHU; or in the other somewhat shorter form Hezekiah or Hebrew Hezeki+YaH, and Elijah or Hebrew Eli+YaH.

Again we find such names as Joel or in Hebrew YO'el, Joram, Hebrew YOram, etc.

It is not improbable that some imperfectly explained word-forms which end in Y could be better interpreted as having their Y from the first letter of the divine name. Remembering that the Hebrew *wav* (=w or v) is the basis of the o and u sounds, we find then, that from the divine name YHVH

YHV is appended to human names as YaHV = yahu.
YH is appended to human names as YaH = jah.
Y is appended to human names as Y = i.
YV is appended to human names as YV = yo or Jo.

The shortest form (Y) is most frequently PREfixed to names, as *Yischaq* (the Hebrew form for our name Isaak) is made

from *schaq* by having Y with the homogeneous *i* vowel prefixed. It is true that *schaq* (which is the verb "to laugh") becomes in the form *Yischaq* akin to our future = *he will laugh*, but it has been long felt that this is a very lame explanation of proper names. Besides the origin of the Y in so-called futures has itself no adequate explanation. It may, therefore, not seem far fetched to explain this prefixed Y, in proper nouns at least, as the shortest element of the Divine prefixed to words to impart to human designation something of the Divine, as a recognition that, in order to be of any worth, human qualities must derive their being from the Divine. This class of proper names is very common in Hebrew, for Jacob, John, Israel, and a host of others are derivatives by means of a prefixed Y.

This Hebrew custom of adding parts of the divine name to human appellations to ennoble the mortal and make it *human* from Him who is alone MAN furnishes in the ancient remains not only a corroboration of the name, but also of its pronunciation.

We must omit here the exceedingly delicate adjustment of vowels and consonants in Hebrew whereby among others the sounds of *o*, *w*, and *u* are closely allied, or the final gutturals require a homogeneous sound (namely, *a*) before them. But the suffixes YaH and YaHV strongly suggest that the original YHVH had anciently the sound YaHVaH, or as the name YV'el implies, YaHVaH, which might be rendered Yahoăh (with final *a* very short).

Here the original stem HVH means *was*. With the *o* sound prominent as HVěH it means *is*, and with Y prefixed as YaHVaH it means *will be*. That the divine name has this threefold meaning is hinted at in Rev. i. 4, where Jesus as the personal Divine is called "He who IS, and who WAS, and who IS TO COME."

It cannot be uninteresting to a New-Churchman, at least, that the Divine in the Book of Revelation is also called the *Alpha* and the *Omega*, which means properly the *A* vowel and the *O* vowel. The Old Testament provides the consonants

YHVH and the New Testament seems to supply their vowels *A* and *O*. Thus YaHVăH (remembering that the final ă is really only the *mechanical* transition from the o-vowel to the emission of breath in H) would seem to unite the Tetragrammaton of the Old and the A(lpha) and the O(mega) of the New Testament, and suggest the proper pronunciation of YHVH as *Yahoăh*. In this word *Yahōăh* the vowels *A* and *O* stand for the Love of the Redeemer, and the consonants YHVH for the truth of His Revealed Word and as such it becomes the Symbol and Union of the divine *Esse* and *Existere*.

J. E. WERREN.

IDLE WORDS: MATT. XII. 34–37.

It is frequently remarked as to trivial matters: "'Twill be all the same a hundred years hence." But will it? What are the grounds for this opinion? Are all the little pleasures and troubles that affect us, and what we think, say, or do in reference to them entirely without influence on our future life? Are our characters moulded and shaped by great events only, while trifling circumstances have but a temporary effect, just as a light breeze may raise transient ripples on a pond, yet leave no sign behind when it ceases to blow? The proverb undoubtedly indicates something of this kind, like the *laisser faire* of the French; such things are not worth troubling ourselves about; they make no difference! Never was there a greater error, or one more actively influencing our very life to eternity; for, just as the mountains are made up of mere combinations of atoms, so is our life a compound of our most trivial thoughts, desires, and acts, which are good or evil in agreement with our ruling love.

The Pharisees, on hearing that the Lord had healed a man possessed with a devil, blind and dumb, so that he both spake and saw, said that He did it "by Beelzebub the prince of the devils"; that is, they charged the very God of love and mercy, incarnated for the salvation of the world, with doing the works of the devil. This fearful profanation was then formulated in words only; but it was ultimated later on in that utmost act of profanity — the crucifixion. Yet even then the Lord's last words breathed divine mercy only: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." But the divine truth spoken from His lips on the former occasion was scathing in its denunciation: "Ye offspring of vipers, how can ye, being evil, speak good things? For out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh."

The forgiveness of His mercy was for those who knew not what they did; the condemnation of His truth was for those who spoke evil out of the abundance of the heart. Had they been blind and dumb they could be forgiven; they said they saw, therefore their sin remained.

The Lord went on to say: —

> A good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth good things, and the evil man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth evil things. But I say unto you that every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment. For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned.

The words that men speak have, therefore, their origin in their affections, and it is from this origin that they are justified or condemned, for the Lord knows the heart from the abundance of which they are spoken. Hypocrites may use words of virtue and kindness with very different meaning, and, though we may often detect their false ring, yet, in a great many cases, they are taken as genuine coin at their face value.

Idle words come from idle hearts; from hearts careless of eternal and heavenly ends; idle in the pursuit of truth; thoughtless of goodness; and selfish at all points. The idle man, as regards his work in this world, is certain not to be a successful man; yet we often hear those whom we know to be useless members of society, whose idle words seem to indicate a spirit of energy and activity utterly foreign to their nature. But though we can judge them on the moral and social plane of external life, we cannot enter into their spiritual state further than to say of their words and actions that they are right or wrong.

There are men, who, under the stress of the want of subsistence, work, but would much prefer to be idle; and others who welcome occasional idleness only as a relief from overwork; but the former would not work if they could help it, and look forward to a time of ease and idleness as the *summum bonum* of life; while the latter feel a delight in work, but are sometimes idle in order to work better later on, for intemperance in work is "wasteful and ridiculous excess."

The man who works best is he who works for the use and service of others, but at the same time does not neglect himself, lest he should reduce his ability for use. If he has a wife and family, it is his first duty to sustain them well. For this end he seeks good wages, but at the same time he endeavors to earn them properly. He feels, also, delight in the thought that his work will be of use to others, and, therefore, takes care to make it serve them well in every respect, careless at the same time for the mere recompense of praise, being satisfied with the testimony of a good conscience.

The idle man, on the contrary, has no desire for work, but does it because he is compelled to earn money for his own support. He also strives for good wages, but does as little as possible to earn them. Such men are mainly responsible for strikes, which are the clumsiest means for increasing wages that can be conceived, and rarely, or never re-pay the distress and misery they cause, while they make use of trade combinations to limit the amount of work a man may do to the capacity or liking of the incompetent or lazy. They are, in fact, the direst enemies of the honest worker or the good all-round man who can turn his hand to anything and do it well, and they make trade rules to prevent men from doing more than one kind of work and that at one dead level as to quality and amount.

Such idleness presupposes an evil disposition; the heart is wrong; there is no love of others, for self predominates in all that is thought or done; both words and works are idle and condemnatory. The fact is that both words and works are the ultimations of thoughts, and thoughts carry the will behind them; and though they do not originate in our own minds, yet they become our own when we accept and appropriate them in our life, because they are congenial to our ruling love. When this is the case they seem to spring from our own volition; we claim them as our own; and such, indeed, they actually become and are shown to others in our words and works. But thoughts which are not in agreement with our affections are rejected by us and consequently do not become our own; for such we are not responsible.

Our mental state in this world is always more or less a medley of good and evil in which not all of either is absolutely part of ourselves. By our nature from heredity we are altogether prone to evil, and but for the loving kindness of our Lord we should inevitably rush into the deepest evils of the deepest hell. Nevertheless, the Lord, by means of our attendant angels, instils into our hearts and minds from our earliest infancy remains of good and truth, calculated to enable us to resist, and, if we so desire, to overcome our hereditary proclivities to evil; so that, in perfect freedom, we may choose the good from Him instead. This mixture of tendencies enables our thoughts to be suggested by spirits good or evil, for those only are associated with us that are in agreement with one or the other side of our states; so that when evil suggestions are stirred within us, the associate angels awake in our hearts such remains of good and truth as are antidotal, and thus establish us in perfect freedom of choice. Our words and works, then chosen, are idle or wise as we prefer them to be, and are, therefore, such as will justify or condemn us.

In the course of our life here these things become more or less part of ourselves. Such of them as agree with our ruling love become conjoined by desire and affection; others are only adjoined by habit or association, or for some worldly purpose. After death we have to submit to the test of the Lord's judgment, the effect of which is to cause us to cling to what we love best, and to relinquish all that we have no wish to retain; for any mixture of good and evil, falsity and truth, cannot be tolerated in our eternal state. If, then, we have loved the idle word and work, they cling to us and condemn us, and all simulation of good and knowledge of truth is dispersed; but if our ruling love is good, the reverse is the case.

This separation is greatly increased in difficulty, even when the balance is in favor of good, if we have been thoughtlessly careless in our conversation, or from having unconsciously contracted the bad habits of associates in our childhood. These become habits in ourselves and are very difficult to eradicate in

later life, but if this is not done, they must be removed after death, before our final state can be complete, which is a matter of more or less arduous and painful trial. If, however, evil predominates in the heart, but there has been a hypocritical assumption of holiness of life for selfish and worldly purposes, the difficulty of separation is accompanied with greater intensity of suffering. This is due to the fact that the cloak of apparent goodness has been deliberately assumed and is tenaciously retained, and its removal is, therefore, all the more strenuously resisted, for the desire of such is, if possible, to deceive even the Lord Himself.

Among the most serious forms of idle words is the careless freedom with which phrases from Holy Writ are made the subjects of jocularity. The interior holiness of the Word itself is, no doubt, fully protected; but in regard to the individual, the evil association of ideas, even though unintentional, approaches in character to absolute profanity, and can only be dissevered with intense difficulty and pain; for we must, all of us, have had experience of the recrudescence of the jest when the words of Scripture connected with it are heard or recur to our memory. How carefully then should the ears of children be protected from the least jocular allusion to the Bible and their hearts disposed to recognize its holiness throughout their lives. This evil is fully represented in the Gospels by the treatment of our Lord — the incarnate Word — by the Jews at His crucifixion.

Here, however, the question may arise as to the practice of humor, jesting, punning, even of laughing at various things in relation to mere externals in our natural life; but there is no difficulty in fixing the limit beyond which it is not right to pass, which lies in the motive from which we act. There can be nothing intrinsically wrong in what is intended for and has the effect of producing harmless mirth and laughter. Even what is called a practical joke — a form of fun apt to degenerate into mere mischievous injury — may be made equally amusing to the subject as to the onlookers, but should never exceed such limits. Nothing is more conducive to pleasure and

amusement, even to external happiness than the practice of whatever pertains to good humor. The joke, the pun, the conundrum, the funny story, the conjurer's tricks are in turn legitimate and harmless sources of amusement, idle words notwithstanding, and serve an excellent use in friendly, harmonious intercourse.

We have no right to belong to that class which is "of such vinegar aspect as would not give their lips the color of a smile, though Nestor swore the jest were laughable." But there must be no *double entendre* to raise a blush, or suggest evil; no Biblical jokes, which are, nevertheless, sometimes affected by teachers of religion, who seem to think the selection of the subject partakes of its source, and the jest is, therefore, in a sense holy. In Cowper's Task, Book II., "The Timepiece," this practice is powerfully satirized:—

> He that negotiates between God and man,
> As God's ambassador, the grand concerns
> Of judgment and of mercy, should beware
> Of lightness in his speech. 'Tis pitiful
> To court a grin when you should woo a soul;
> To break a jest when pity would inspire
> Pathetic exhortation; and to address
> The skittish fancy with facetious tales,
> When sent with God's commission to the heart!
> So did not Paul. Direct me to a quip
> Or merry turn in all he ever wrote
> And I consent you take it for your text,
> Your only one, till sides and benches fail.

So long as the inner divinity of the Word remains unrecognized in the churches it is to be expected that it may be treated with but little more respect than any human composition; yet with some, especially the simple-hearted, there is still retained the sense of a special kind of holiness which leads them to look on it with reverence. The modern critic, however, treats it entirely from its human side, disregarding its claim to a divine origin and authority, and concerns himself more with its textual accuracy and human authorship. But though thus relegated

to the class of other ancient religious books, the Bible stands *sui generis* among them all; and is still the source of wonder and even of veneration that puzzles while it attracts men to its study. The attempt to treat it as of merely human origin with only a surface meaning, must inevitably fail, for it leaves out of consideration the wonder of its vast influence in the world, and that of the English-speaking races among the nations. Both are due to the fact of its inherent divinity, even though feebly recognized by those in England, who have, nevertheless, distributed the Holy Book in its native simplicity and purity, unsullied by human explanations and commentaries, broadcast over the whole earth in nearly every spoken language. In the course of time the feeling of reverence towards it will predominate; its real nature will be acknowledged; and idle words will no longer pollute reference to its pages.

We may, I think, conclude that the harmless joke or good-natured humor and its concomitant mirth and laughter are not prohibited as idle words. We learn from the Writings that the origin and essence of laughter is either the affection for truth or in an evil sense, the affection for falsity. It signifies the affection for truth as being the expression of that affection passing from the rational mind into the face. Rational good does not express itself by laughing, but by a kind of joy in the countenance. Isaac was so named from laughter; Abraham laughed from joy when his birth was promised; Sarah laughed from unbelief.

In Latin *rideo*, to laugh, has principally a favorable signification, as to laugh pleasantly, to smile, to look cheerful or pleasant; it is also sometimes in the sense of ridicule, but in a milder sense than to deride. *Arrideo* has a pleasant sense, but does not seem to have served in any English form of word. It is given as meaning to laugh at or with, to smile at or upon, especially in approbation; to be favorably or kindly disposed to one, to be pleasing, to please. *Derideo* is the worst form in all its uses which are, to laugh at, to scorn, to scoff at, to deride, to mock, to make game of.

Laughing is thus discriminated according to the affection from which it arises and may, therefore, be evil or good. We may, with Addison in the *Spectator*, prefer cheerfulness to mirth, yet still allow the latter a place in our expressions of happiness. He says: —

> Mirth is short and transient, cheerfulness fixed and permanent. . . . Mirth is like a flash of lightning that breaks through a gloom of clouds and glitters for a moment; cheerfulness keeps up a kind of daylight in the mind and fills it with a steady and perpetual serenity.

Exception may, perhaps, be taken to the severity of the comparison of mirth to lightning, as true only of its coarsest and most malevolent forms. Happy mirthfulness is closely kin to true cheerfulness, being indeed only its exuberant form; it does not burst forth from the gloom of storm, to be followed by the crash of thunder, but is more like the sunshine in April which dries the tears shed by the rain clouds as they pass. It may, indeed, be taken as the very climax of perpetual cheerfulness, which should not be maintained forever at the dead level of uniformity; but, like the sea, is all the better for a gentle breeze to stir its sparkling ripples to glitter in the sun.

Who has not been charmed by the bright, bubbling laughter of the baby, while still under the loving care of the celestial angels, and reflecting their holy happiness and joy. It is only as years creep on and our spiritual associates are of a more mixed character, that the love of mischief gives rise to the laugh of derision and evil mixes with a cruel mirth. Like many other things, mirth and laughter are somewhat similar in expressing mental feelings that are very dissimilar in character; for they may show the delight of the evil at the misery and discomfort of others; or the gladness of the good at their welfare and happiness. Even placid cheerfulness may cover gratification at the misfortunes of our friends, by the sense of our superior wisdom in avoiding the same result.

Only a miserable ascetic or a rigid puritan would prohibit mirth or laughter; the true Christian would seek so to direct the pleasures and enjoyments of the young as to keep them in

states of love and charity to all, and in especial reverence to the Lord Jesus Christ above all. In such case, though there would be no restriction to their mirth and laughter, it would never express malevolence or derision. Ridicule and unkindness would never mar the geniality of their familiar intercourse. Their lives would be crowned with joy and gladness, which they would delight to share with their friends; their jokes, their puns, their humorous stories would never be sullied by irreverence for the Holy Word, nor offend against religion or good taste; the world would be all the better and more enjoyable for its general cheerfulness and good humor; idle words would cease to offend the ear or to condemn the speaker, "and the loud laugh that shows the vacant mind" would be no longer heard.

J. B. KEENE.

THE VIRGIN BIRTH OF THE LORD.*

This book will be welcomed by the scholars of the New Church; for its purpose, well carried out, is "to establish faith in the miracle of the Lord's incarnation by birth from the virgin, to meet objections, and to show the intimate connection of fact and doctrine in this transcendent mystery." Not that there is any lack or faltering of faith upon this subject, or is ever likely to be, among New-Churchmen; but because there is great and increasing lack of it in the Christian denominations and in the world about us. Indeed, it is believed by many that a turning point or crisis has been reached with reference to the person, character, and mission of the Christ; that a radically new kind of Christ literature is the order of the day, and that the modern theological mind will either have to demolish the new conceptions or adjust itself to them. The tide is setting towards skepticism.† But it is re-assuring at least to hear from such a man as Professor Ihmels, the occupant of the leading conservative chair of systematic theology in Germany, that "the question as to the historical existence of Jesus has now been absolutely settled. The day of Strauss's 'myth' theory is over. No sane man doubts that Jesus was a historical person, that He was born in Bethlehem, that He died on the cross. The problems now in the foreground pertain to His divine or human character, His Messiahship, to His birth and resurrection as foundations of church doctrine."‡

From a New-Church point of view, Professor Orr in his lec-

*"The Virgin Birth of Christ." Being lectures delivered under the auspices of the Bible Teachers' Training School, New York, April, 1907. By James Orr, M.A., D.D., Professor of Apologetics and Systematic Theology in the United Free Church College, Glasgow, Scotland. With Appendix giving opinions of living scholars. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. September, 1907. 12mo. cloth. 315 pp. $1.50 net.

†*Current Literature*, November, 1907, p. 530. ‡*Ibid.*, p. 531.

tures deals with the problem of first importance, the Virgin Birth, the question whether the Lord had a human father or not. The peculiar value of his work is not that he catches any glimpses of the truths given to us from the spiritual meaning within the letter of the Word of God, but that comprehensively he sets forth the objections now being made and meets them on their own ground, in the light of the letter of the Sacred Scriptures and of the history of the Christian Church. He first shows that this time-honored doctrine is now being vehemently assailed by some higher critics and by such preachers and writers on the New Theology as R. J. Campbell. He says: —

> It is not a question simply of liberty to the individual conscience, of tenderness and forbearance towards Christian brethren whose minds may be in doubt and perplexity on this subject: that is a totally different matter. It is a question, actually, of the right of the church to retain in its public creed this fundamental article of the oldest of all creeds — an article based on express declarations of two of our Gospels and found in the creeds of every important branch of the Christian Church in the world at the present hour — the article, namely, that Jesus Christ, our Saviour, was "conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary." The right to retain this article, you must be aware, is in the name of modern thought and criticism, boldly, even peremptorily, denied us. With whatever graceful acknowledgment of the poetry that may lie in the heart of the old Christmas story, the time has come, we are told, when that story must be parted with, and the belief it enshrines once and forever left behind as serious affirmation. (pp. 1, 2.)

After referring to the attacks upon this belief in the past as mild in comparison with those now being made by the "so-called historical-critical school with its open repudiation of everything supernatural in the history of Jesus," he states the ground of the denial of the Virgin Birth, to wit: —

> The narratives of it are found only in the introductory chapters of two of our Gospels — Matthew and Luke — and are evidently there of a secondary character. The rest of the New Testament is absolutely silent on the subject. Mark, the oldest Gospel, and John, the latest, know nothing of it. Matthew and Luke themselves contain no further reference to the mysterious fact related in their commencement, but mention circumstances which seem irreconcilable with it. Their own narratives are contradictory, and, in their miraculous traits, bear clear marks of legendary

origin. All the Gospels speak freely of Jesus as the son of Joseph and Mary. The Virgin Birth formed no part of the oldest apostolic tradition, and had no place in the earliest Christian preaching, as exhibited in the Book of Acts. The Epistles show a like ignorance of this profound mystery. Paul shows no acquaintance with it, and uses language which seems to exclude it, as when he speaks of Jesus as "of the seed of David." Peter, John, the Epistle of the Hebrews, the Book of Revelation, all ignore it. If thousands were brought to faith in Jesus as the divine Redeemer in this earliest period, it was without reference to this belief. There is no proof that the belief was general in the Christian Church before the Second Century.

On the other hand, it is alleged, the origin of this belief and of the narratives embodying it, can be readily explained. It grew out of a mistaken application of Old Testament prophecy (Isa. vii. 14), or from contact with or imitation of pagan myths; and is itself an example of the myth-forming spirit which ascribes a superhuman origin to great men or religious heroes. In any case, it is no essential part of Christian faith. Nowhere in the New Testament is anything ever based on it, and neither the sinlessness of Christ nor the incarnation itself can be shown to depend on it. Why then, it is urged, burden faith with such a mystery? Why ask men to believe in that for which, in conscience, they do not think there is sufficient evidence? Why retain so doubtful an article as a binding part of the creed of the church? (pp. 7, 8.)

The whole book before us is devoted to exhaustively meeting these criticisms and denials as mutilations of Scripture, contradictions of the continuous testimony of the church from apostolic times, a weakening of the doctrine of the incarnation, and a practical surrender of the Christian position into the hands of the advocates of a non-miraculous, purely humanitarian Christ — all on insufficient grounds (p. 229). For Professor Orr urges: —

It is not with these writers, as we soon come to discover, a question of the Virgin Birth alone, but a question of the whole view we are to take of Jesus in His person and work; not a question of this single miracle, but of *all* miracles. . . . We constantly hear it said — Even if the Virgin Birth is given up, there is enough left in the Gospels to furnish a secure basis for faith and hope. My point is, that, with these writers, the rest of the record does *not* stand — is not allowed to stand. . . . If the Virgin Birth is attacked so pertinaciously, it is because it seems to them the weakest of the Gospel facts in point of evidence, and because they feel instinctively that its

overthrow would mean so much. It would be like the dislodging of a great stone near the foundation of a building, that would bring down much more with it. (pp. 9, 10.)

Thus the entering wedge of scepticism is discovered in season, and the scholars of the church at large are being rallied to repel the assault upon the foundations of the Christian religion. The Appendix of the book contains excerpts from papers by some of the most prominent Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Jewish scholars, which have been submitted to Dr. Orr in confirmation of his positions.

New-Churchmen will find themselves in full sympathy with this defense of what to them is the headstone of the corner in all theological building. For if Joseph were, indeed, the father of the Lord, as alleged, then would He be the Son of God in the same sense only that other men are sons of God; and then would our preaching and our faith be as vain as if He had not risen from the dead. If there had not been a real first coming of God to men, a real divine incarnation in Him, then there could be no second coming. But here the perfect security of the New Jerusalem appears, for when one beholds the Lord Himself in the clouds of the letter he perceives and knows that He is God-Man, and that the clouds which reveal Him, and which have been made Divine-Human in Him, are indeed His Holy Word and Divine Truth in every particular when rightly and rationally understood.

We are constantly reminded of this as we follow Dr. Orr through his reverent, patient, and painstaking study of the clouds of the letter of the Sacred Scriptures, exposing error after error of the so-called higher critics, and drawing and confirming the doctrine of the Virgin Birth from the letter of the Divine Word. And we feel sincere gratitude to him for thus toiling to preserve the foundations; and then with joy we recall the motto of the New Church, "Nunc licet,"—now it is permitted to enter into the mysteries of the Christian faith. For at every step of progress, as one point after another of denial is met and refuted, the "divine mystery" re-appears, and we see that the honest

doubts of a rational scepticism cannot be met and satisfied until that mystery is explained. Here is where a precious work is to be done by the rational truths revealed by the Lord through His servant Emanuel Swedenborg. There Dr. Orr and his reverent associates among the higher critics would find the help needed to show philosophically and scientifically why the Lord must be born of a virgin and not of two human parents, in order that a Divine-Human, a God-Man, should exist upon earth. He would be helped to see how the Lord was sinless while clothed in a sinful nature from Mary, how He could by that means meet in person and conquer and control forever all the evils of the human race, subjugate and govern all the hells of human iniquity; and that this is the essential thing in His work of redemption. He would be helped to see how a human fatherhood was not only not needed for this, but would actually interfere with it and prevent it, because the heredity from the father cannot be put off, but must persist even when made quiescent after death; but the heredity from the mother can be entirely separated and put away. So the Son of God had a divine paternal heredity which must persist, and finally make Him wholly divine and one with the Father.

It is just at this point that the defense against the assaults of rationalism and scepticism appears weak; and must always be weak until these truths of the Lord in His second coming to the reason and the spiritual life are received and employed.

The defense seems to be strong in showing that the introductory chapters of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke are a genuine part of those Gospels and not of a secondary character; that the narratives are not contradictory, but that in Matthew is Joseph's version, while that in Luke is Mary's; that the silence of the rest of the New Testament, including the writings of Paul, does not imply the ignoring of the Virgin Birth, but rather the general knowledge and undisputed acceptance of it; that the Old Testament prophecies, instead of giving rise to myths, were constantly sought out by the evangelists to illustrate and confirm the interpretation of the facts of the Lord's

birth and life; and that He Himself made this use of the writings of the prophets and taught His disciples to do so; that the early church fathers made this use of prophecy to establish the Messiahship of the Lord, and it was precisely on this point of the Virgin Birth that they were most keenly assailed by Jewish and heathen opponents (p. 136); that apart from the Ebionites, or narrower section of Jewish Christians, and a few Gnostic sects, no body of Christians in early times is known to have existed who did not accept as part of their faith the birth of Jesus from the Virgin Mary. (p. 138.)

So the objections are firmly met and refuted on the grounds of textual criticism and history. But the strongest argument of all is not a new one; but is put with new vigor and emphasis, as indicated by the following: —

> Here, then, arises a problem: this presence of an absolutely Holy One in our sinful humanity: How did it come about? Can nature explain it? Is not a miracle involved in the very statement of the fact? Undeniably, I think it is. The late Prof. A. B. Bruce justly says: "A sinless man is as much a miracle in the moral world as a Virgin Birth is a miracle in the physical world." It is very interesting to my mind to notice how our modern advocates of a humanitarian Christ, naturally born from Joseph and Mary, deal with this fact of the sinlessness of Jesus. My experience is that there is hardly one of them but hedges when he is brought face to face with it. . . . I do not mean that there are not those who accept the moral miracle, but deny the physical (for example, Schleiermacher, Keim, Beyschlag). I shall come to their case immediately; but it must be owned that commonly, in practice, belief in the miraculous birth and belief in the sinlessness of Jesus stand or fall together. (pp. 191, 192.)

In meeting the belief in a moral without a physical miracle, Dr. Orr approaches the New-Church doctrine of correspondences, for he says: —

> The reply I have to make to this form of theory, which fain would separate the spiritual from the physical miracle, is simply this — and here I draw my next broad line —*the thing cannot be done.* My ground for this assertion is that, in the nature of things, spiritual and physical are so intimately related that you cannot have a change so vitally affecting humanity on the spiritual side which does not involve a corresponding change on the physical side, or in the sphere of organism. (pp. 197, 198.)

It is a corollary from the known laws of the connection of mind and body that every mind needs an organism fitted to it. If the mind of man is the product of a new cause, the brain which is the instrument of that mind must share in its peculiar origin. You cannot put a human mind into a simian brain. (pp. 199, 200.)

One more quotation will suggest how the book deals with the alleged analogies with heathen myths: —

A supernatural birth which has for its end the founding of a new humanity, and the introduction by a Redeemer of the divine forces needed for a world's salvation, is wide as the poles apart from those fables of the lust of the gods with which the birth of the mythical heroes of paganism is associated. (p. 207.)

H. Clinton Hay.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

THEODORE FRANCIS WRIGHT.

When the wholly unexpected word came to us that Dr. Wright had been called to lay down his varied activities here to enter upon those of the spiritual world, the present number of The Review, not without help and advice from him, had practically been made up, and the main part of it had already gone into type. Under these circumstances, and for other reasons which will readily occur to our readers, it has seemed better to delay the publication of an extended sketch of our brother's busy life and valued services to our April issue. There it can have the leading place, and, with other material, which it is hoped will be forthcoming, may give to that number the character of a fitting memorial of one who has held a large place in the recent life and work of the New Church.

Dr. Wright's intimate relations to The Review, however, dating not only from the appearance of the first number, but from the very inception of the idea that gave it birth, seem to call for a few immediate words of acknowledgment upon these editorial pages which have never failed, in a single instance, to record helpful utterances from him.

And, at the outset, it should be said that he came to the managing editorship of this periodical not without a very considerable experience. For fourteen years he had held the position of sole editor of the later series of *The New-Jerusalem Magazine*. In a brief valedictory note, published in the last number of that series, appears the following paragraph which most happily indicates the spirit which had entered into his duties: —

> When I took up the work and knew that a large amount of material was to be put to press punctually, year in and out, I was at first doubtful, but came in time to see that the same Providence which cares for all things could be trusted here, and I have never failed to have a fair supply of suitable matter furnished, often by those who were working without my knowledge. To the Divine Friend then let me utter heartfelt gratitude.

But with this uplooking trust had gone likewise into his editorial work no small degree of energy and alertness in securing contributions from the best writers of the church, accompanied by a ready ability to prepare original matter at short notice and in great variety.

The first issue of THE REVIEW quickly followed the close of the second series of *The Magazine*, bearing the date of January, 1894. The earliest suggestion of the establishment of such a periodical seems to have been made by Dr. Wright in an editorial published four years previous entitled, "Can We have a Review?" This called forth several approving responses, and two years later in thanking the author of one of these, he says, "The whole subject is daily in mind."

When at last it became apparent that we could have a Review which might realize with some degree of truthfulness the character that its title would suggest to the intelligent and thoughtful mind, and that its publication would be provided for by the body which still issues it, the Editorial Board, to which its interests were committed and of which Dr. Wright was a member, turned at once to him as their suitable executive. His years of training had developed exceptional qualifications for the position, and it went to him without question.

How ably, faithfully, and conscientiously he has filled this place for the fourteen years' existence of THE REVIEW, which he was with us to complete, those who were associated with him during all, or a considerable portion of those years, can most heartily testify. Many other interests were directly committed to his charge or called for a share of his time and energy, and in several instances they were interests that should and did rightfully claim precedence over his editorial work — but that work was never neglected. His orderly methods, his remarkable ability to pass quickly from one subject to another, and his wonderfully retentive memory were indeed important, perhaps we may say, indispensable aids; but, apart from these, was his deep interest in the editorial use as a real and far-reaching one. To gather suitable material for THE REVIEW; to seek that it should be widely representative of the church; to give encouragement to new contributors; sometimes, successfully to work over matter contributed that his fellow-editors had viewed as hopeless; to keep the needs of THE REVIEW in mind in all his reading, even that of a recreative character; patiently and kindly to reply to com-

ments and criticisms; promptly to correct errors and remove misapprehensions: — these were a few of the editorial principles that seemed to hold with him the place of axioms.

Some of the most valuable of Dr. Wright's own contributions may be found among the "Studies," which, to the more scholarly readers of THE REVIEW, form a weighty part of each issue. His supply of these seems to have been well-nigh inexhaustible, and they were kept constantly in reserve to fill out the pages of this useful department.

His editorials, to which we have already incidentally referred, were uniformly interesting and timely and in their variety and scope revealed the marked activity of his mind. As striking examples of this quality careful readers of THE REVIEW may recall those contributed during his stay abroad in 1902–1903, when he wrote at some length of "The Planting of the New Church in Europe," "The Might of Intellect," "The Religious Outlook," "Liturgical Progress," and upon other themes suggested by his studies and observations in foreign lands.

He left with the promise upon his lips that THE REVIEW would frequently hear from him during the ensuing year. Outwardly, that promise must go unfulfilled. But we are assured that the world to which our brother has been transferred will afford full and ample scope for the exercise of his earnest love of use. And as that world is near at hand, and he who has entered there carries with him all his deep life interests, the sphere of his enlarged activities may still reach and help us. And so the promise that could not be fulfilled in the way anticipated may yet have a higher fulfilment, the value of which cannot be measured. To use his own words, written upon these editorial pages, respecting another whom we all loved and looked up to, "his influence for good may still be strong and even stronger than before."

W. H. M.

CHURCHES AS SOCIAL CLUBS.

Complaints are often made that the churches, especially city churches, do not show a Christian spirit in welcoming strangers and the poor to spiritual privileges and fellowship in the Saviour's love.

The Ladies' Home Journal has recently resorted to an experiment to test this. A "plain young woman" has been employed to visit the churches of the East and West and report upon their social qualities. In one hundred and nineteen out of a hundred and fifty she was practically ignored. Thirteen pastors spoke to her, but only seven voluntarily. Not a single minister came and greeted the stranger first. In every case she waited until the congregation had passed out.

We cannot believe that this is a true indication of the way churches generally feel towards strangers; for, if from no higher motives, for the sake of filling up the half-empty pews, visitors are earnestly desired. But the difficulty arises, at least in part, from an uncertainty as to how far advances will be agreeable to the stranger on her first visit. Still this is no excuse for the neglect and almost rudeness reported in too many cases.

The Catholic Monitor, noticing that only non-Catholics were visited, finds the opportunity to point to a contrast between the Protestant and Roman Catholic churches, as follows: —

> The Protestant Church is a club, but the Catholic is the house of God. The Catholic expects no human welcome; his welcome comes from the depths of the tabernacle. He cares not whether his fellow-worshippers greet him or whether courtesies are extended to him. He goes to his church because he has a right and because it is his duty. Bound together by a common belief, afire with the same love, urgent on the same purpose, all the worshippers are brethren — brethren whether in the jungles of Africa or in the stately edifice in the crowded city. There are no strangers.

Here two extremes are presented. In the Protestant churches sacramental worship becomes secondary to human interests; but in the Catholic Church human considerations are swept aside by sacramental observances. The brotherhood is entirely sacramental, no place is found for human sympathy and sociability. The thoughts are absorbed in the ritualistic worship of God.

In either extreme the motives may be selfish and destructive of the genuine church, which consists of both love for God that is expressed in worship, and love for men, going forth in friendly words and deeds. The tendency of a selfish sacramentalism is to keep men in ignorance and in bondage to ecclesiastical authority, as illustrated by the recent syllabus of the Pope against Modernism and the decree to remove Modernists from all Catholic educational institutions. The tendency of a selfish humanitarianism is so forcibly presented by *The Catholic Monitor* that it seems well to quote at some length as follows: —

It must be evident by this time to observant men that the Protestant churches have degenerated into mere social clubs. They have no other binding tie and seemingly have no other ulterior end than the social features. There is no longer required any unity of doctrine among the members of the Protestant Church; in fact, doctrine is rather considered the badge of narrowness and illiberalism. Pulpit and pew are without any positive doctrine or the need of it. Modern Protestantism has lost all appreciation of doctrine and the sweet tryanny of truth. The Methodist minister exchanges pulpits with the Baptist, and he in turn with the Presbyterian, with delightful inconsistency as though the doctrines in their official standards of faith did not differ an iota from one another. The teachings of the ministers within the same sect differ widely. Each has his own doctrine-plant. Each preaches his own opinions, ventilates his own views. Sensationalism, and not doctrine, dominates the Protestant pulpit. The minister preaches what pleases his people and fills the pews on Sunday morning. He ignores any such duty as measuring his utterances by the standard of his church's confession of faith.

The confusion of the pulpit is reflected in the pews. Each member sets up his own standard of belief, if he does not ignore all positive doctrine. He goes to the church service to be entertained or amused. His mental attitude is not that of a man of faith, seeking the doctrine of his church. He compares the opinions of his minister with his own opinions and is pleased accordingly. To keep alive his interest, he, with his fellow-members, demand an able minister, an eloquent minister, a sensational minister. They pay their money to the club and they desire in return an up-to-date service. Outside of this, they see no reason to attend the church, unless perhaps to satisfy an exacting wife and soothe her religious nerves.

Doctrine gone, preaching satisfactory, the minister must develop the social side of his make-up. . . .

Therefore, any stranger who appears is taken in charge. The better dressed she is, the more refined, the more welcome. The glad hand is extended to her; polite ushers lead her to a prominent pew; a new hymn-book is provided; her attention to the sermon is duly noted and the quality of her voice. After service, the responsiveness to the churchly courtesies draws a group of women members around her; they compare notes with her till the minister appears and is intro-

duced. She is invited to return the following Sunday. And all the ladies await her the next Sabbath — if she has come in a coach. Gradually a new member is annexed to the club to become part and parcel of its working force. Possibly, the stranger is neglected at the church door. Her mien or her habit is not attractive. Mayhap the neglect is the veriest oversight. But her feelings are wounded. There is an undercurrent of bitterness as the result, for, let it be confessed, the newcomer's notion is somehow or other not that of a church, but of a club. And so the sad comedy goes on from Sunday to Sunday — the tragi-comedy of modern Protestantism.

Certainly the single purpose in going to church should be to worship God. It should never be to seek a pleasant social time, however pleasant may be the friendships of the worshippers and the sociability of the vestibule. The Sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Supper should be received most reverently as the divinely appointed means of acknowledging the Lord as God, the Redeemer and Saviour, and as a means of loving conjunction with Him and association with His angels and His disciples on earth — which is not only a conjunction and fellowship in worship but also is to be continued into daily life and service. Hence becoming a member of the church is first of all to establish a most sacred and blessed relation with the Lord and with the angels as well as with men; and the church is the Lord's and is a divine institution in an entirely different category from a social club.

Properly enough the candidate for membership in a social club presents himself to the club and is accepted or rejected by them; and being well dressed and riding in a carriage and being educated, refined, and talented may have much to do with the matter. But the candidate for membership in the church presents himself to the Lord; he comes to confess his sins and his need of forgiveness; he comes in poverty of spirit and hungering for the bread of heaven. Not by men is he to be accepted or rejected. The Lord receives him, if he is sincere, in the tenderness of infinite love; and the members of the church have only to rejoice and welcome him as a brother in the household of the one heavenly Father. The church exists for this purpose and has no other right to existence and no other business in the world.

This should determine the attitude of the minister and of every member of the congregation towards the visitor. It should be one of glad welcome to a share in the tender mercies and bountiful blessings of the heavenly Father's house. And especially should this be true

of the New Jerusalem, where there is no lack of definite and true doctrines, and where the Divine-Human of our Lord is plainly shown to be for all men, and where the need of every one in his own place in relation to that Divine-Human, and his right to his own place, is so clearly revealed.

The Spirit and the Bride say, Come; and let him that heareth, say, Come; and let him that thirsteth come; and let him that willeth take the water of life freely. (Rev. xxii. 17.)

H. C. H.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL AS HISTORY.

They who oppose themselves to the Gospel of John on account of its testimony to the divinity of the Lord, are always making an unfavorable comparison of it with the other Gospels, alleging its unhistorical character. In a recent issue of *The Open Court* there is such an attack upon it from the pen of the Rev. Philip S. Moxom, pastor of a Congregational Church in Springfield, Mass. He says: —

Apparently we have in the Fourth Gospel a theological treatise, in illustration and proof of which comparatively little use is made of the tradition that lies at the base of the Synoptics and furnishes their main biographical material, and the author freely modifies this tradition. . . . It is not a Gospel in the sense in which the term may be properly applied to the Synoptics. It is a theological treatise, using real or assumed biographical material for the development, illustration, and enforcement of its argument. The biographical form was used probably because thus the writer could gain a readier hearing.

To this the editor adds the words: —

The Fourth Gospel is the most unhistorical, and we must never read it with any attempt at translating it into a realistic and pragmatically clear conception of fact.

To all this the Gospel of John is itself the best answer, and its answer is unmistakable. It alone distinctly lays out the three years of the public ministry and furnishes the historical details which the other Gospels do not give. In John alone (chapter ii. 13 to iii. 21) we have the account of the first Passover, of the ministry in Judea (iii. 22), and of the return to Galilee at a time fixed by the phrase "four months to harvest" (iv.). In John alone we are told of the second Passover (v.), and again of the third, which the Lord did not keep at Jerusalem (vi.). It is John's Gospel which alone tells of

His presence at the Feast of Tabernacles in the Autumn of that third year (vii.), and again of the Feast of Dedication in December (x.); and this Gospel alone describes the visit to Bethany (xi.); and it alone tells of the arrival at Bethany six days before the last Passover (xii. 1). It is to this Gospel that we are indebted for certain post-resurrection details essential to a clear understanding of the forty days.

This being true, that the Fourth Gospel alone unmistakably indicates the periods of the Jewish years from the beginning to the end of the public ministry, what is there in this oft-repeated assertion that it is unhistorical, but careless criticism? This was shown long ago by Ezra Abbot and others. There is a beautiful exactness in the historical statements in John, because they so firmly place and so strongly emphasize the discourses to Nicodemus, to the woman of Samaria, to the multitude as to the living bread, and to the disciples at the Last Supper. It seems to have been left for the final Gospel to give the historical framework on which the parables, miracles, and discourses of the Synoptics would forever depend.

Incidentally it is interesting to note that so radical a thinker as Dr. Moxom sees in the Fourth Gospel its evidence of the Lord's divinity: —

> It is a claim of identity of essence with the deity. . . . Jesus makes himself the object of saving faith. . . . He is consciously the Messiah. . . . He implies his pre-existence. . . . He manifests a sense of unity with God. . . . He receives without rebuke the ascription of the divine name from Thomas. "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father," shows that Jesus was thinking, not merely of a moral oneness with the Father, achieved by the utter subjection of his will to God, but an essential consubstantiality with God.

These statements show that Dr. Moxom does not evade the literal force of the Fourth Gospel. He is mistaken, however, in supposing that there are not some such passages in the Synoptics, though, in their literal sense, they deal more largely with the teachings and deeds of our Lord and less with His utterances as to His own nature and office.

T. F. W.

WHAT IS NEEDED MOST OF ALL.

THE brethren of the New-Church faith in Great Britain have a wise way of choosing each year as the President of their Conference some experienced minister who is then enabled by his society to be absent for the year so much as is necessary to make the rounds of the churches, seeing their conditions and planning for their growth. When the Conference meets again he is able to give much valuable information and some equally valuable suggestions. Thus he does not give an address of general application, but he is able to speak very definitely of the needs of the church.

In the last address prepared by the retiring President, the Rev. William T. Stonestreet, of Manchester, after bringing out interesting results from his year's supervision of the societies, he gave expression to sentiments which our American readers should have an opportunity to see as they stand vigorously expressed in his closing words: —

Many of us would like to do, and would be willing to do, some great thing for the church; but the great need of the time, especially in the present state of religious unrest, of indifferentism, and the neglect of church worship and observances, is for the patient and persistent practice of the simple duties of membership in the church and Christian citizenship. No one can measure the influence of one man who persistently keeps the Sabbath, regularly attends to his religious duties, is always at church with his family at worship, maintains the practice of family devotion, and lives a consistent Christian life every day among his friends and in his daily business. His influence outweighs all that genius, great gifts, and a commanding personality can ever do for the church.

I am convinced from my study of our organization that there is a large latent spirituality and power in our community. There are all the elements for making our church a vital influence in the world. There is everything needed to bind us in a real spiritual brotherhood, to upbuild a living church in the world, and to carry us forward to great religious triumphs. The problem is how can this latent spiritual power be brought forth and focussed, so concentrated as to be a real means of progress.

It is my firm conviction that this can be done only by realizing as we have not yet done, the living presence with us of the Lord in His divine humanity. I am prepared for the criticism that this is merely repeating words said over and over again before. It is not a question of words, it is a question of living realities. Do we as a church really believe that the Lord tabernacles with His people,

that He dwells with us, that we are His people, that God Himself will be with us, and be our God? Do we know and do we feel that the Lord God is present with us in our humanity on the level of our human life, in touch with all our weaknesses and wants, our sins and sorrows, and able to help and save us at every point? Do we realize that the Lord is veritably MAN, a real man; that He was a man in all points tempted as we are, but now glorified and victorious and divine, but still a man, always with us, able to save to the uttermost and within the reach of the lowest and worst of our race? It seems to me that in the realization of this divine personality, or as we term it, the divine humanity (this for which all Christianity stands, which the incarnation presupposes, which the Gospels all through depict and testify, and which the resurrection and ascension unite to declare) we have the solution of our problem. It is here that we can call forth our latent power; it is here that we can focus that power for spiritual victory and success. Just as our personal faith in the Lord Jesus Christ as our one God and Saviour makes us new creatures and new characters, so will the realization in the church of the Lord Jesus Christ as the incarnate God and the divine Man transform the character of the whole body, and uplift it to a level never yet attained. For character, in the individual, and in organizations of individuals, depends essentially upon this conviction. Education hardly touches it. Morality at best only shapes its outward form. It can be reformed and renewed only by the deepest spiritual force, and that force can only come from Him who is Himself the New Man, the divine and glorified Lord of our nature.

I look to the time when we shall realize vividly and fully the living presence of our Lord the Saviour as the head of His church; when we shall feel a more intense personal devotion to His will; when our loyalty and service will be not to a name, great and wonderful as that name may be, but to that being whose name will reveal more and more fully to us His divine human personality; and whose spirit, for which we pray, will be His spiritual presence and power, leading us onward and upward to His kingdom and Himself. The three great elements of success are here. Faith, that strongest of all mental forces, not a shadowy or unreasoning faith, but a faith clear, rational, and strong. Faith and one who is the centre of our faith, our personal Lord and God. Not an unreal or remote Deity; not a God divided and inconceivable, not a God mysterious and repugnant to our higher ideals; but a God with us, the inspiration of all that is highest and best in us. A God whom we can know, because He reveals Himself to us; a God whom we can honor, worship, and love, because His character is honor, love, and greatness in their highest form; a Lord and God whose presence with us makes all life a new and holier thing, who transforms and renews our life and character, because He has Himself infilled it, renovated it, glorified it and made it divine. Faith, life, and trust in the Lord Himself are the elements of success; they are all within our reach. No member of the church is too humble to possess them. Every one is called to realize them for the benefit of himself spiritually, for the good of the church, and for the progress of the world.

T. F. W.

"WHO IS THE CHRISTIAN DEITY?"

An article with this caption in *The Hibbert Journal* for July, 1907, had especial interest because in a way it advocated the doctrine of the Divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ. The author, Mr. James Collier, of Sydney, Australia, is evidently a careful reader of history, but not a theologian. He says in a foot note that the view which he presents came to him when reading "Gregory of Tours" and also Feuerbach's "Essence of Christianity" and finally James Martineau's latest suggestions for a reconciliation between Unitarians and Trinitarians. He believes that "Christendom is now and has long been mistaken about the real object of its worship," and that "Christianity is pre-eminently the worship of Christ."

> The working, ever-living, and ever-acting Deity is Christ. He is the Creator and Preserver of the world, the Ruler, Redeemer, and Judge of men. To Him have been transferred the attributes of Jehovah. He and no other is the Christian God.

Mr. Collier does not find this doctrine as clearly set forth in the Gospels as afterwards by Paul who, in his judgment, fully expressed it. In the early fathers there is progress toward the single object of worship. Christians were reproached by their critics like Celsus and Lucian as worshippers of Christ and did not deny it. They defended themselves for doing so. Tertullian held that "all divinities but Christ ought to be renounced as false." Cyprian was less definite, but others upheld and promoted the doctrine, until "the Father practically disappeared from the Christian consciousness." Augustine, however, somewhat interrupted this process. The Christian poets of the Fourth Century, Paulinus and Prudentius, habitually used "God" and "Christ" as identical terms.

Mr. Collier takes the view that in the conversion of the nations of Europe the worship of Christ was presented as the alternative to that of Jupiter or Thor or Woden or other divinities. Two hundred years from Augustine writers are found to speak of Christ as God. The schoolmen, Alexander of Hales, Duns Scotus, and Anselm, held the same view. So with the "Imitation of Christ," Pascal, Joinville; and so with the miracle plays, and so with mediæval art. It is held

that "among Catholic peoples this conception has never been relinquished." Nor did Luther take a different faith. Of Protestants Lyman Beecher, Horace Bushnell, Henry Drummond, George MacDonald, James Martineau, and James Freeman Clarke are mentioned as making Christ supreme. Modern missionaries carry this doctrine to all lands.

Mr. Collier adds to his review the remark, "Not only to heretics like Swedenborg is Christ the sole Deity," showing that he has some knowledge of Swedenborg, but no conception of the full explanation of the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ which is found in the works of Swedenborg and found there alone. And this shows the defect of Mr. Collier's argument that he cannot remove, nor find in any of his older authors the means of removing, the obvious difficulties in receiving the risen Lord as the one God, which difficulties appear to many in the letter of the Gospels and are removable only by a clear understanding of the "Doctrine of the Lord for the New Jerusalem."

There are passages in Paul which Swedenborg constantly quoted. Others have enjoyed finding similar passages in the fathers as did our brother, the Rev. S. F. Dike, D. D., in his little book on, "The Doctrine of the Lord in the Primitive Christian Church," but a rational conception of the doctrine which would satisfy intelligent men was altogether lacking until Swedenborg was led to see it and enabled to publish it at the time of the second advent.

The weakness of Mr. Collier's position appears on the mere mention of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds which he wholly ignores. These and these alone state the actual beliefs of early Christians. Both Catholic and Protestant theologians upheld the Trinity, and it was from this position that Unitarians recoiled. Channing did hold a high Arianism, but not so Martineau and Clarke whose readers must smile at Mr. Collier's classification of them with Beecher and Bushnell. Bushnell, MacDonald, and Drummond knew the teachings of our faith and in their way proclaimed them, but the Calvinism in which they were reared had an utterly tri-personal God as its confused object of worship.

It is true that Trinitarianism has waned and Unitarianism has increased, and precisely this was said by Swedenborg of the views prevailing in the other world among those who represented the Christianity of his time. He tells in "The Apocalypse Revealed," 294, and "The True Christian Religion," 111, of an experiment tried

among spirits as to their faith in the Lord and their power to speak His name as divine and says: —

From this experiment it was discovered that the greater part of Christians at this day are either Arians or Socinians, and that such, if they worship Christ as God, are hypocrites.

We would not do injustice to Mr. Collier or to any who may follow his lead, but we shall not be surprised if his article goes unheeded, as not sufficiently thorough. Some good may be done by it, however, by its uncomplimentary reference to Swedenborg. Of course he was a "heretic," for the church did not at all hold with him on essential points of the Christian faith. If the church held what Mr. Collier attributes to it, Swedenborg would not be counted as a heretic.

T. F. W.

TRUE WORSHIP.

A READER of our REVIEW in advanced years expresses a fear lest the enlargement of our worship by ceremonies may cause it to be external, formal, and dead. He has carefully collected several passages bearing upon the subject and has sent them to our office. We fully agree with him that there is a tendency to extreme ritualism which may well cause some apprehension, and yet we believe that the intelligence of our lay people will act as a check upon any ministers who may be too much given to forms, so that no permanent harm will result. At the same time it is well for all to keep in mind such teachings as the following: —

The church is a church from life according to doctrine and the life according to doctrine is worship. (Apocalypse Explained, 799.)

To act according to the Lord's commandments is the true worship of Him. (Arcana, 7038.)

After the good of charity ceases in a church external worship remains, but then it is not worship but ceremony. (*Ibid.*, 6587.)

When good and truth are conjoined in a man there is Divine worship in every work which he does. (*Ibid.*, 1014.)

When the Lord came into the world He abrogated representatives, which were all external, and instituted a church in which all things should be internal. (True Christian Religion, 670.)

They who believe that they can dispose themselves for influx by prayer, adoration, and the externals of worship, are in error. These are of no effect unless the man abstains from thinking and doing evil. (Apocalypse Explained, 248.)

External worship separated from internal turns itself away from the Lord, for they who are in external worship look only to what is corporeal and earthly. (Arcana, 1093.)

The more sensuous a man becomes the more external does his worship become, and, therefore, the more remote from the true worship of the Lord. (*Ibid.*, 1153.)

Worship which is from man is not worship. The confession, adoration, and prayers which are from man are not received by the Lord, but they must be from the Lord Himself in the man. (*Ibid.*, 10299.)

It is, of course, the lesson of all preceding churches that they have fallen into externalism or some form of idolatry. This has been especially the case with Christianity, which had at first only the very simplest forms of worship and then gradually drifted into the most elaborate Romanish pageantry. Protestantism retained many of these empty forms and there is always a tendency, even in our own body, to return to them. We cannot be too careful to refrain from imitating these usages of a dead religion and to practise only those forms of worship which express true inward devotion of all the life to the service of the Lord.

T. F. W.

MISSIONARY WORK IN THE NEW CHURCH.

In the earlier discussions of this topic, carried on in our councils and our periodicals, the relative usefulness of scattering the truths of the new dispensation broadcast was very frequently called in question. It was forcibly claimed that much more effective results could be realized by steady and persistent labor in a few promising localities. The broadcast method was likened to the work of a sower of grain who, after throwing in his seed should pass on leaving the possible crop uncared for and unreaped.

We make this allusion to the past with no thought of reviving a discussion which the changed conditions of the religious world at large would render quite unprofitable. Practically all among us are now agreed that there rests a responsibility upon the New Church to sow the heavenly seed committed to her charge "beside all waters." While this is to be done judiciously, with a wise discretion, it is to be done without anxiety as to the immediate and visible results to be achieved. For no thoughtful mind can fail to realize that the New Church is to-day called to perform a neighborly use for many sin-

cere and earnest souls connected with the religious bodies around us. Those to whom we refer are, for a variety of reasons, not prepared to sunder the ties that outwardly bind them to their present church homes, nor are they very likely to take that step in the future. And yet they greatly value the teachings of the New Church. Indeed as these teachings reach them by means of the printed page or the spoken word their hearts are ready to respond to their essential truthfulness.

For such the New Church has an important work to do. And it is to be done in a neighborly way, without especial thought of adding to her own household. We may find this work quite distinctly referred to in the Book of Deuteronomy, where the command is repeatedly given to lend but not to borrow, as in the following passage: —

> For the Lord thy God blesseth thee, as He promised thee; and thou shalt lend unto many nations, but thou shalt not borrow; and thou shalt reign over many nations, but they shall not reign over thee. (xv. 6.)

Thus with grateful joy we may pass on the rational truths which we have received to those who feel the need of something which can afford them a satisfying and restful faith — something which they would otherwise vainly hunger for.

But without for a moment questioning either the value of this service or our responsibility to render it at all suitable times and in all suitable places, we must insist that this is not the primary work of the New Church. The primary work of the New Church looks to its existence and its maintenance as a church. This is clearly implied in all that has been said about the neighborly uses of the New Church. Neighborly uses involve the presence of a neighbor who is to perform them. And as far as specific uses are referred to the proper equipment of the neighbor fulfilling them is necessarily involved. So, in order effectively to perform the neighborly uses indicated above, there must be a New Church having the fitting external equipment for its work. Such a church must be more than a mere missionary propaganda. It must do more than provide for the publication of the works of Swedenborg and for the preparation and circulation of books and tracts explanatory of the doctrines which he was commissioned to bring to men. All this is but incidental to the existence and ministrations of the New Church *as* a church.

Let a deep, thorough living interest be awakened in the truths re-

vealed to us in the writings of Swedenborg and shown to inhere in the Sacred Scriptures when their divine and spiritual quality is made manifest, and sooner or later there will be felt, among those who cherish this interest, the need of a church whose ministrations shall harmonize with these truths. It must be a church where the Lord Jesus Christ is looked to as the one and only object of divine worship. It must be a church where the Sacred Scriptures are reverently lifted above all human writings and are explained and expounded as the infinite Word of the Lord. It must be a church where the vital truths are never lost to sight that "all religion is of the life," and that the life is to be ultimately measured by the quality of the love which inmostly inspires it. And it must be a church wherein a belief in the reality and the fitness of the spiritual world as the ultimate home of men is inculcated not only by rational deduction based upon human needs and cravings, but by a setting forth of the abundant and authentic information respecting that world which Swedenborg was authorized to give to men.

Without attempting to define the limits of the New Church or to mark with any degree of distinctness the relation which the external organization bearing this name holds to other religious bodies, it is a palpable fact that it stands alone in the world as openly affirming and teaching these truths and inculcating worship according to them. Hence we may safely assert that the first and chief responsibility of the New Church is to provide a spiritual home for those who, acknowledging that "the tabernacle of God is now with men" and that He has come "to dwell with them," would be "His people," and would recognize Him as "their God." A home where they can be constantly fed with "the bread that cometh down from heaven," and where their children may be nurtured in the clear and beautiful truths now revealed, and trained by means of them for a happy and eternal manhood and womanhood.

Do not let us be misunderstood. The church home is not to be an exclusive home, nor is it to be one where a life of spiritual self-indulgence is led. It is rather to be a home that shall send forth its life and its brightness to all who are without. But just as on the natural plane, we are to take care of ourselves in order that we may be well-equipped for our uses, and with this end in view the natural home is to be made comfortable and orderly and beautiful, so is it with the church as a spiritual home. There, as on the natural plane

of life, it is true that the charity which is to begin in the home is not to end in it. It is to make the church as an outward organization, more effective as a spiritual power in the world; more efficient as a neighbor to do the neighborly work of which the world to-day stands in vital need, but which must be done without solicitude as to results. "In the morning sow thy seed, and in the evening withhold not thy hand; for thou knowest not which shall prosper, whether this or that, or whether they both shall be alike good" (Eccl. xi. 6) is most useful instruction in this connection, although it be not drawn from the Word itself. In every wise and fitting way is the New Church to seek to cooperate with the Divine Providence in placing before the world the heaven-descended teachings that mark the new coming of the Lord to men, but let us not forget that there must be a church to do this, and the stronger that church shall be, the more effectively will this work be accomplished.

W. H. M.

BIBLICAL AND DOCTRINAL STUDIES.

PSALM XX. 3, IN "ARCANA," 923, AND OTHER PASSAGES.

THE familiar verse, "Remember all thy offerings and accept thy burnt sacrifice," has a peculiar rendering in the first volume of the "Arcana" in the Rotch and Library editions. Swedenborg's invariable rendering of the second clause is,—

holocaustum tuum pingue faciet.

This part of the verse may be seen in "Arcana," 923 and 5943, "Apocalypse Revealed," 782, "Apocalypse Explained," 1159, and also in *Index Biblicus*, iv. p. 611. It is an exact rendering of the Hebrew *dashan* to say *pingue facere*. The old translation "accept" was an inference, but not an exact rendering. In the older translations of the "Arcana" from the Latin, "accept" was used alone, in the Rotch edition it is "accept as fat," and this is followed by the Library edition, but it is impossible to see how this renders the simple sentence, "make fat thy burnt offering." We may understand by the prayer that the Lord will accept the offering, but neither Hebrew nor Latin says that, and it certainly is a bad confusion of thought to read "accept as fat" when this is neither unmistakable English nor a translation of the Hebrew and Latin.

T. F. W.

A RELATION MODIFIED IN RESTATEMENT.

IN "The Apocalypse Revealed," 675, we have the relation in regard to a society of English in the spiritual world to whom a paper was sent down from the Lord through heaven, exhorting them to acknowledge the Lord as the God of heaven and earth. Some accepted it, but said that they must hear the opinion of their bishops. These wholly disapproved. Upon the general refusal which followed to accept the teaching, the society sank down, but after some days

some came back, and one narrated the fate of the new teaching which had been fully considered; the two bishops grew more averse than at first and declared anew for salvation by faith alone. Thus the case with them was hopeless and they controlled the rest.

The same relation is found in "The True Christian Religion," 389, but with the remarkable change that all allusion to the spirits being English is omitted. Instead of a "society of English" we have a "society in the world of spirits." Instead of two "bishops" we have "leaders of the church." The phrase about the "inner judgment" of the English is omitted. So it goes all the way; the "wise Englishman" who gave the account becomes "our wise man." At the close in "The Apocalypse Revealed," we read, "The wise Englishman told me these things," but instead of this we read in "The True Christian Religion": —

> That spirit, who had ascended with a hundred others from the lower earth, told me these things.

Is it not probable that Swedenborg, who had come to know Hartley and others, deemed it best to print nothing which reflected upon their nation?

T. F. W.

"ARCANA," 10610, OMITTED.

READERS of the last volume of the "Arcana" may have observed that there is no paragraph numbered 10610, but that No. 10609 is followed by No. 10611. If they have looked into the matter they have seen that a phrase of the text is also omitted, so that it and its interpretation are lacking. This phrase is at the beginning of verse 4 of chapter xxxiv. of Exodus, and reads in English: "And he hewed two tables of stone like unto the first." The paragraph was undoubtedly written as the omission of the No. 10610 shows to be the case, and its omission is no doubt due to an error of the printer. It was probably very short, since it was only necessary to refer the reader back to No. 10603, which explains the words of the Lord: "Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first."

As to what should be done in the new editions of the "Arcana," the manuscript in the Royal Academy of Science at Stockholm should be consulted. Indeed no new editions of any of Swedenborg's works

should be made without the use of the original manuscripts if they exist. In this case, however, it may be sufficient to transfer from the summary explanation in No. 10601 the following words: —

"And he hewed two tables of stone like unto the first" signifies such an external of the Word, the church and its worship as was for the sake of the Israelitish people.

T. F. W.

THE FOURTEENTH CHAPTER OF MATTHEW.

This chapter narrates three events: —

1. The Death of John the Baptist, verses 3–12.
2. The miracle of the Feeding of the Five Thousand, verses 15–21.
3. The Ship in a Storm and the Walking on the Sea, verses 24–33.

Each event has two introductory verses and three verses form the conclusion of the whole.

In the first event the scene presents a feast at which Herod presides. The entertainment, an intoxicating dance, is followed by the death of John. In the second there also is a feast, but at this feast with Jesus thousands are wonderfully fed and their lives preserved. The last scene brings before us a voyage in the strength of the food which had come from the Lord's hands.

Verses 1, 2. The two introductory verses show Herod in his attitude to the "hearing of Jesus." Herod's declaration to "his boys": "This is John the Baptist; he is risen from the dead and through this the powers energize in him" is neither a declaration of his belief in the resurrection, nor a firmer hold on the personality of John. It is rather Herod's interpretation of this "hearing of Jesus" to "his boys"—the rising generation. The declaration shows that in the "hearing of Jesus" he recognizes an effort to "energize," that is, to call up with renewed emphasis, the deeds of John. He implies that John's powers — exaggerated in Jewish minds — are sought to have new life imparted to them from the works of Jesus, with a view to have the impression of the dead John rejuvenated by this Jesus. And underneath this Herodian view seems to lie the implication to "his boys": "You see, this vaunted John is dead; he had no such powers as the reported deeds would require; if he had them, I could not have killed him. The claims that are made for this Jesus have

no more foundation, as you will see." This is the Herodian spirit. Herod believed neither in John nor in Jesus.

It is true there is another meaning to Herod's words with a true prophetic ring though beyond his understanding, which will be brought out in the sequel.

Let us look a moment at

HEROD.

From history we know that he was the son of Herod the Great. To him fell a fourth part of his father's kingdom in this eastern extremity. An Idumean by extraction he was tinctured by Semitic blood. His name is Greek, *Herodes* meaning the heroic. In his official capacity he is a Roman. Apparently a sovereign (he is called "King" in verse 9), he exercises the supreme Roman power in this Palestinian country. His official capacity as *tetrarch* is left undefined in the New Testament, but these four characteristics stand out clearly in that history, and they render it perspicuous: the *Semitic* taint marks the centre of his self-poise; the *Greek* education stamps his intellectuality, and focusses all events under intellectual sight.* The *Roman* quality is the desire of ruling from his own intelligence.† The *Roman Ruler in Palestine* is the effort of establishing the natural rule over the church and spiritual things.‡

THE DEATH OF JOHN.

Verses 3–12. Herod is celebrating his *genesia*. Whether this means his birthday (as Authorized Version and Revised Version hold), or his accession to the royal power(as the earlier interpreters read)

*"The way of Greece" is Intelligence (*De Verbo*, 155). From Correspondences the Greeks made fables; of the Divine attributes so many gods; the greatest, Jove, from Jehovah. Heroes are "those who believe nothing but what they apprehend by what is sensuous and scientific" (Arcana Cœlestia, 1072). And again: "those who aspire after great things" (Apocalypse Explained, 376[37]), and "have great ability and skill in adulterating the truths of the Word" (*Ibid.*, 618[3]). "Their reasoning from falsities against truths and consequent assault upon them" is signified by "running as heroes." (JOEL ii. 7.)

†The power of the Roman rule is evident in every civilized country, for the code of Roman laws is at the bottom of every constitution.

‡The Romans longed for immortality of fame more than others. (Diary, 2147; compare Arcana Cœlestia, 8499).

is immaterial, for the former implies the latter, and in the latter his full character appears. The feast is a celebration of his coming into the full power of that which is implied in "Herod," namely, the autocratic rule of intellectuality over everything, even the church.

The dancing of Herodias's daughter. — Both the noun *choros*, a dance, and the verb *orcheo*, to dance, are peculiarly Greek, and the latter is here recognized in its effect upon the king, when he "promised with an oath to give [to the dancer] whatsoever she would ask." That he recklessly gave up his reason is clear, hence the dance may be called intoxicating. The king feasted with his eyes on that which suggested the enjoyment, out of which had sprung his illicit relationship with "His brother Philip's wife," Herodias.

Psychologically there is here a new feature. Herod's relation to Herodias marks a purely sensuous enjoyment. His relation to "the daughter of Herodias" is the enjoyment of sensuality in an intellectual way. These two manners of enjoyment are related as curiosity is to the love of amusement and as sensuous excesses which belong to youthful life to salacious sensuality of intellectual maturity.

This indicates a period of transition; the change is perceived in Herod's disappearing after this episode from further mention in this Gospel. The dancer is not mentioned by name, she is always called "the daughter of Herodias."* This indicates that the affection for an intellectually sensuous life was in its beginning; and for its development dependent upon the fostering care of the sensuous love of the former age. This daughter is also more definitely called "the little girl" — *Korasion* —to indicate that the intellectually sensuous life had actually begun, and already had an individuality. Lest this new form of evil life should have unbounded sway, the Lord had already raised another affection which learnt to love Him and worship Him. This is the *Korasion*, or little daughter of the ruler. (MATT. ix. 18–26.)

The dancing which beclouded Herod's intelligence demands its reward. This reward is the satisfaction coming to the new debased intellect. Before the new affection for the debased intellect is fully confirmed the old affection suggests the reward — Herodias prompts what the daughter asks, "Give me here John Baptist's head on a charger."

*Josephus gives her name as Salome.

JOHN THE BAPTIST.

Briefly, John the prophet stands for the Word as a revelation; the imprisoned John for the Word deprived of its revelation and the curtailment of life's freedom in that revelation. This leaves the Word a mere history of the Jewish people. That the Word was deprived of its power as a revelation was suggested already in MATT. xi. 2, and more definitely reported here, verses 3 and 4, where we learn how it was shorn of its spiritual power: when the sensuous life desiring an adulterous union was reproved of its impurity, the stings of conscience were removed by the imprisonment of John, that is, by the stifling of the voice of conscience which speaks from the dictate of revelation. The birth of the new form of sensuous life requires the removal of the idea of a divine revelation from the Word; this is indicated by the death of John. The word "death" is, indeed, not used in the narrative, only the head of John the Baptist. Instead of being left on its own body it is to be brought on a charger; his disciples bury the body. The head, the intellectual side of the Word, would be put on a new, artificial ultimate, a charger; the real life of the former church, to which the revelation of the Word belonged, would be buried — withdrawn to heaven.

The disciples of John are those who loved to understand the literal sense of the Word and to live the simple life inculcated by the letter. The simple life connected with such study would cease, and with it the reliance upon the letter of the Word, and, therefore, to the seekers for support in the natural a new ultimate would be given — after burying the body, "coming they told Jesus." Their coming implies that they remained near Jesus; in Him they found what they had lost in John.

With those who did not follow Jesus — Herod's group — the lifeless head, or the purely intellectual consideration of the Jewish history, deprived of its life and power as a revelation was set on an artificial ultimate, a charger.

Those who read attentively perceive that the death of John the Baptist is not recorded here as now taking place, but really to make clear why Herod explained away "the hearing of Jesus" in the presence of "his boys." John the Baptist was dead before the fact is recorded. It means that the voice of revelation had been dead, and this was because the Jews had already made the Word of none effect

by their traditions. They cherished the letter mainly because it recorded their national history. If it were nothing but a civil history the Word would be of very little use to the world. What the Word as a mere historical monument was to the rising intellectual world appears plainly from the Septuagint in which the Jewish books of profane origin, such as were collected in the "Writings of the fathers" (namely, Proverbs, Job, Song of Songs, Ruth, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles) were mingled promiscuously with the "Law and the Prophets," the Word as a revelation. The artificially arranged Word which passed from the Septuagint into all modern Bibles is the *pinaxi*, the charger, upon which a well-nigh lifeless intellectuality has come down even to the days of historico-critical study of the Bible.

But the Word must have an ultimate upon which it can rest, and while the Old Testament, the only Word extant in the time of Herod, lost its power and came into almost complete desuetude, a new ultimate was provided in the story of the Lord's own life. Though in the time of Herod's "boys" this also was made artificial by the admixture of human deeds and words, still the Lord's life was to the simple the joy to behold and to follow, so that John's disciples could continue the simple life. But the Herodians would here also continue to see the dead John's head on a charger, even until the time would come, after the Word had fully passed from the Jews, that the Lord's life would be seen written, beginning at Moses and in all the prophets, Daniel, and the Psalms.

The Lord had foreseen all this change in the aspect of the Word with men, and He provided His own life as a human ultimate which men could change in every manner suiting their varied affections, and yet a life which should preserve what is divine as the means of saving all who seek Him with the heart, no matter how ignorant in life.

THE MIRACLE OF THE FEEDING OF THE FIVE THOUSAND.

Verses 15–21. Here is another feast. The elements though apparently very different from those in the former feast are in important respects the same. In Herod, the ruler, three elements are united — the Semitic, the Greek, and the Roman. As the head at his feast he presents them all. Now these same elements are all

present, but in a "great mixed crowd."* There is, however, an intrinsic difference in this, that the elements are tractable.

THE DISCIPLES.

Instead of the death-dealing servants of Herod, this feast has aids that minister to life — the twelve disciples. From their names (chapter x. 2–4) it appears that they are partly Semitic, partly Greek, and (one at least) a mixture of both (Simon Peter). As men they were of "the mixed crowd," as disciples and apostles (x. 1, 2) they are learning of the Lord and come from Him. They do not as yet know the Master in His essential quality. He is to them no more than a man, yet perhaps different from any other man. These twelve are the collective representation of a human faculty, which the Lord cultivated with especial care, the human faculty of coming to Him and learning from Him — a faculty which was also willing to go forth from Him. That faculty of rising out of common states into higher ones and going back to the common life with higher ideals is the rational in the intellectual.

FIVE LOAVES AND TWO FISHES.

The "five loaves" which the disciples had were intended for their natural nourishment, and are expressive of the scant measure of satisfaction in their experiences. "Two fishes" were also intended for food, but are not further mentioned in this miracle,† for in verse 21 it is expressly stated: "He gave the loaves to the disciples." The fishes, the highest elements in the natural sphere of life, come to view, but are not yet ready for use. When they do, the Lord's natural will appear distinct from the merely human, but that comes afterward.‡ The five loaves brought to the Lord and accepted by Him are the satisfactions of human life which He accepted and shared with men by His coming. The "breaking of the loaves"

**Ochlos* is not "a multitude," but "a mixed crowd."

†They are indeed fully brought out in MARK vi. 41 and LUKE ix. 16; but when the Gospels are viewed as a continuous revelation there is a reason for every difference.

‡It is interesting that in the Apostolic Church the word for fish, *ichthus*, became a cryptogram for the Lord as worshipped, standing for Iesus, CHristos, THeou, 'Yios, Soter, that is, Jesus Christ, God's Son, the Saviour.

is His examination of them, as well as making those states by His own experiences in them more fully serviceable in the individual lives. "The disciples giving to the mixed crowd" reminds us of the need of receiving and applying the goodness of the Lord's life with some degree of intelligence, in order to make the human of man look up to the human of the Saviour. We remember the disciples had not yet any deep knowledge of Jesus, whom they followed, but seeing Him as a sympathizing friend of men was enough to attach to Him and hold that mixed crowd, even until a fragment of His satisfaction from the natural life was shared by them. That life without Him appeared as "a desert place," but with Him there was a little food and even enough for all in the present state.

There is no mention of any receptacle in which the food was *brought*, but after the feeding there are vessels: "They took up of the fragments that remained, twelve baskets full." The new experiences with the Lord were to be with them and to form precious remains through all the coming life. The "baskets," or rather "hampers" (*kophinos*, from Hebrew *kaph*, hand) were the new memory for spiritual experiences with the Lord, by which the store from the new life would be ever at hand for service.

The "five thousand men without (*choris*) women and children" are the abundant service to the rational intellect, at first apparently without any influence upon the affections or any promise of new life.

Here it appears plainly that the Lord provided food for them out of the loaves they had brought. Food for men is provided in His Word. He accepted what appeared to them in the Old Testament — the history of the Jews — and mingled His life with it, but Himself kept in view the discrete degrees in it by His "breaking" it. And He added the story of His own natural life as a new ultimate, which, though apparently superseding the Old Testament for a while in the apostolic age, was destined to fulfil the old and make it alive to eternity.

When Herod said concerning "the hearing of Jesus": "This is John the Baptist, he is risen from the dead, and therefore powers energize in him," he uttered also a prophecy; yet he was ignorant of the fact that, when seen in the *light*, his words meant that the history of Jesus's life on earth, seen in the Old Testament history, would impart power and living energy to "the Law and the Prophets" far beyond anything that lay in them as a Jewish history; for so it would become "the Word made flesh."

THE STORM AND WALKING ON THE SEA.

Verses 22–33. If the feast was men's sharing something of the Lord's life, the departure of the disciples and the sending away of the mixed crowd mark the return to the ordinary states of life. Men go down, though they bring something new, a little experience, with the Lord home with them. The Lord's life ascends with every step nearer to His divinity. The return from states of elevation is not accomplished without disturbance — hence, the storm.

In the Old Testament we hear of no ships that belonged to the Hebrews. Knowing that ships are types for doctrines, this absence of ships reminds us that the Semites, up to the coming of the Lord, were not essentially makers of doctrines, but above any branch of the human race they were those through whom the Word of God came into this world. But in the time of the New Testament Greek learning had become prominent and was making itself felt in the age of the disciples. Greek civilization meant essentially mental culture, philosophic or rational thought. We must here think of the age rather than the school of philosophy. That even these poor fishermen were affected by the spirit of the age is indicated by this that in the New Testament ships are among the things possessed by the Jews. We also get a glimpse of what was in the ship of the disciples, for the outcome of this return from the miracle to their ordinary state of life is in the last verse (33) of this part of the narrative: "Then they that were in the ship came and worshipped Him, saying, Of a truth thou art the Son of God."

Now this confession did not come suddenly upon them, for the ship is mentioned three times: first in verse 13: "Jesus . . . departed thence by a ship into a desert place apart"; next in verses 22–30: "Jesus constrained his disciples to get into a ship and to go . . . unto the other side." While they depart and the ship is in the midst of the sea it was "tossed with the waves." Lastly it is this ship from which Peter descends to essay his walking on the water and to which he returns with the Lord. These are the steps by which the Lord prepared His disciples to obtain a glimpse of the power by which He walked calmly over the waves with which they struggled.

To speak without a figure: the disciples were beginning to think rationally of the great difference they perceived between the Lord and themselves, and the Lord prepared the way that rational thought

might be drawn from His natural to His essential personality. Here they start with an idea of Him as a mere man (verse 22); then they conceive Him as a phantom (verse 26, not as Authorized Version, "a spirit"), and at last as "the Son of God" (verse 33). That this chapter opens successive views of the Lord's personality and His appearance to the slowly opening rationality of men as a mere man (verse 22), as an imaginary man (verse 26), and a superior man (a Son of God verse 33) appears still further confirmed from the facts that He continues His human demonstration (so to speak) in the transfiguration (chapter xvii.) which prepares for His manifestations in the resurrection. To all these successive and ascending human conceptions of Him He finally adds the full text in the last book of the Word, which He calls "the Revelation, or unveiling, of Jesus Christ."

The difficulty of the rational thought conceiving the difference between the Lord as man and any other man is presented in the episode of Peter's attempting to walk on the water. The Lord had no turbulent water, because He never allowed His natural to rule. Peter was ignorant that the storm was in himself, as well as a part of the state of the age about him. He, therefore, seems to think that all that is needed to make him walk on the water is the Lord's command. "Command me," says he, "to come to thee on the water." The first difficulty, if Peter would really desire to walk on the water, was his lack of knowing himself. Another element which he overlooked was in the Lord's walking on the water. He was "walking freely about" (*peripateo*), because Jesus had subdued every purely natural desire; He could, therefore, walk at liberty. When Peter had leave to "come," he also tried to walk freely, but when his first glance burst forth, he saw the strong "wind" — the *animus* of his own nature in opposition to the whole of the Lord's spirit of life — and "he was afraid . . . beginning to sink." These two differences in the apparently similar outer lives — that of Peter, the choice intelligence of the day, and of the Lord — are sharply contrasted and separately emphasized in this postlude to the storm: but as they were not distinctly seen they could not as yet be used. They are "the two fishes" which are mentioned at first but not used in the miracle, that is to say, the knowledge of man as man and the Lord as divine man. Since this difference was not yet rationally seen, the Divine could not yet manifest itself in this ultimate openly as the divine saving power — for the miraculous divine power is the power to save men.

What the Lord had actually accomplished at this time was then not the rational knowledge and acknowledgment of His divine human in men of that age, not even the disciples; but the implantation of faith in Him as the beginning and the inmost of the rational in the intellectual when He saved Peter from the engulfment in the waves. "Jesus stretched forth His hand and caught him and said unto him, O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt?"

The three closing verses depict the clearing of the atmosphere, and the consequent descent of order into the natural so far as this faith first opening the natural to the Lord's spirit would permit.

In this chapter we have the problem which the Lord as the Word was meeting when the record of revelation passed from the Jewish Church to the western world (1–12). Here is shown how He provided a new ultimate in the history of His natural life in the place of the former Jewish history (13–21). Lastly there is shown the preparation for a progressive approach to His divine human by preserving first a living faith in Him (22–end).

J. E. Werren.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

New Theology Problems.*

People in this country can scarcely understand how great a commotion was caused in England by the utterances of Rev. R. J. Campbell, of the City Temple, London, in that pulpit and all over England and by his published views. His attitude was such that every religious publication and every pulpit canvassed them and pointed out their inconsistencies, for Mr. Campbell had very little to put in the place of Calvinism except a pantheism which went beyond Unitarianism and was rather pagan than Christian. Among others the gifted and experienced pastor of the New-Church Society, in Birmingham, delivered four lectures on the "New Theology Problems," and this attractive little volume, published and sold in the general book trade, contains his views. He discusses candidly and critically the new ideas of God, the Bible, Sin, and the Atonement.

Naturally, Mr. Campbell is made to speak for himself, so far as space will allow, and naturally Mr. Rodgers then in each case points out the errors and states the truth as forcibly and clearly as possible. Thus as to God he shows that Mr. Campbell confuses the infinite and the finite, denies the divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ, and by the immanence of God means pantheism. And so as to the Bible, it is human literature; and so as to sin, the distinction between good and evil is lost sight of.

Mr. Rodgers makes little reference to the New Church as such, and in Birmingham he did not need to do so. Nor does he so style himself on the title page, but names himself "Minister of Wretham Road Church"; but in speaking of the Bible he says in a foot-note:—

> Should the reader wish to study the Bible spiritually, he will find a beautiful and consistent system of spiritual truth clearly set forth in the writings of Swedenborg.

In speaking of the Atonement he gives much information as to

**New Theology Problems.* By Rev. R. R. Rodgers. London: Frederick Warne & Co. 1907. 91 pp. Cloth, 40 cents. Paper, 25 cents.

past dogmas in brief space and openly states what is held "in the New Church." His quotations from Bushnell show familiarity with that writer, whose influence is all for good since he had positive views in accord with the faith of the New Church and was constructive where Campbell seems to be only destructive. The latter is a man of whom little will be heard in twenty years. Mr. Rodgers wrote for the general Christian reader, and did his work skilfully, and his book is likely to be useful to many.

New Sketch of Swedenborg's Life.*

Every minister of the New Church has felt the need of making and using one or more lectures on the life of Swedenborg, though the full biographies have been prepared by laymen, Worcester, Hobart, Dawson, Trobridge, and others. Mr. Rodgers, of Birmingham, has supplied his own need and that of other people in the two lectures here neatly printed. He puts his information in a very attractive form, starting off with a bright paragraph about the year 1688 and going on in an interesting way, so that one who already knows the facts of Swedenborg's life will enjoy reading these lectures for their piquancy. He says at the outset in his frank way: —

> In speaking of a man we are bound in honesty to speak of him as we find him. This will necessarily displease those who are prejudiced against him, and those who are prejudiced in favor of nim. Only the unprejudiced can estimate a man truly. Friends think too much and enemies too little of the good qualities in each other. But whether I underrate or overrate the works, character, and life of Swedenborg, nothing but a candid perusal of all his writings and all the documents on record relating to him can prove.

Mr. Rodgers is very apt with quotations, and shows that he knows the biographies well. He clearly indicates the earnestness and steady intellectual progress of Swedenborg, and he closes by saying that whoever reads the writings will find "so pure and humane, so unselfish and chaste a spirit breathed in them that he cannot fail to rise from them a very much wiser and better man." It is a good sketch, smaller than a biography, yet full enough for some people.

**Swedenborg: the Philosopher and Theologian.* By Rev. R. R. Rodgers. London: James Spiers. 1907. 63 pp. Cloth, 30 cents. Paper, 20 cents.

Realities of Christian Theology.*

In a remarkable degree this book shows that the progress of the new orthodoxy is towards the teachings of the New Church. Indeed, the conclusions reached are, in nearly every instance, rational and Scriptural confirmations of what we are taught, but always confined to the natural plane and never reaching up into the light of the spiritual world. It is, nevertheless, gratifying to find that the letter of the Word can be so truly interpreted — can afford so much true doctrine in the light of earthly experience.

The author starts out with the method indicated by the following statement: —

> Laws of evidence, canons of criticism, principles of interpretation, have the same validity with reference to Christianity that they have elsewhere. In this respect Christian theology has undergone a profound change, but it still withholds a part of the price unless it surrenders itself completely to the spirit which maintains that the great business of the human mind is first to ascertain facts and then to seek an interpretation of them which, instead of doing violence, shall be the unforced expression of their inner meaning according to necessary laws of thought. (pp. 1, 2.)

Hence he rejects all external authority when it comes as an arbitrary or coercing power — traditions embodied in creeds, customs, and institutions of the church, even the Sacred Scriptures — and he makes the ultimate moral authority that and only that which has its seat within his own consciousness, saying: —

> Even "supernatural revelation" can contain nothing which is permanently repugnant to human rationality and no body of privileged men can ever hand down to their fellowmen truths inaccessible to human experience. (p. 3.)

He excludes metaphysics only when they set bounds to human knowledge or shut out the evidences of a living experience of the love of God in Christ. Psychology he finds of great value in tracing the history of the consciousness of God, of the conceptions of sin and sacrifice, and of a belief in the future life. Indeed, through it alone can one come to an understanding of the human conditions and limi-

**Realities of Christian Theology: An Interpretation of Christian Experience.* By Clarence Augustine Beckwith, Illinois Professor of Systematic Theology in Chicago Theological Seminary. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. October, 1906. 12mo. cloth. 420 pp.

tations of revelation, of moral and spiritual personality, of sin, of conversion, of the personality and work of the Redeemer, of the new life, of the kingdom of God, of the second coming, and of life after death.

In a word, then, all the presentations of the Scriptures and all the teachings of the church and all the beliefs of the present day have to submit themselves to psychology for adjudication. (p. 11.)

Evolution is accepted as furnishing an interpretative principle to all the events with which theology is concerned. "All that is is to be viewed as a becoming." He not only accepts as a fact the origin of man's body by evolution, but also of his mental, moral, and religious capacity. Even the person of Christ is viewed as subject to the same law of development. He adds: —

If, however, evolution is the constant, universal method of the divine action, then we shall find in it neither naturalism on the one hand nor on the other hand an arbitrary and violent supernaturalism. "All things are of God." (p. 12.)

Thus theology or doctrine and revelation also have come to human consciousness under this law or by this divine method. We read: —

The essential condition for the development of theology is the continuity of religious experience. The Christian life has in every age been nourished from the same divine source, however diverse may have been the interpretations of it. Certain elements of experience have been constant. (p. 25.)

Theology is the interpretation of the age to itself in terms of religious thought. (p. 26.)

Thus the conclusion is reached that the immediate source of Christian theology is the consciousness of the Christian man, but not without the Gospel of the Lord Jesus, the Christ, as a divine power creating faith, uniting the soul to God, setting free from sin, and quickening the hope of eternal life. (p. 32.)

By this we understand that the Bible is not set aside, but is regarded as a record only of religious experience until it becomes a life in the experience of the reader. Reading about God in the Bible gives no real revelation of Him, but He is found in the application of what is read to the relations of human life. The writer seems to us weak at this point, and we attribute it to his ignorance of the fact that a spiritual meaning within the letter of the Word of God gives it the power of associating men with angels and of conjoining them with the Lord and of thus filling their minds with heavenly light and quicken-

ing their hearts with divine love. He does not know the spiritual depths and power of divine revelation.

The lack of this shows in the book all the way through, but especially in the chapters on God, the World, Man, and the Person and Work of Christ. But still, as already noted, he does not go far astray in his rational conclusions. He studies the names of God in the Holy Writ and finds that they all reveal Him as a person and in human relations with men. He is one, holy, righteous, omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent, but, above all, loving. Thus the following: —

> If we inquire more particularly concerning the idea of God as it took final shape in the Christian consciousness, we discover the central principle of it to be love. The Old Testament discloses various preparatory stages through which apprehension of God as love passed on its way to ultimate expression. In the New Testament the love of God, dominating the consciousness of Jesus as the unique Son of the Father, retains and perfects the elements of the Old-Testament idea, comes to complete manifestation in Jesus Christ, and is henceforth the final and interpretative truth as to God's character and action. (p. 37.)

The world is regarded as not only created by God, but as having its "eternal causal ground in Him." He says: —

> In such a position the doctrine of creation is not surrendered, but for the first time rightly stated. (p. 54.)

Swedenborg so stated it a hundred and fifty years ago. And he taught also what the author presents as remarkably new in reference to the modern theory of evolution.

> That the providence of God is as real and essential in earlier, that is, prehistoric, as in latest stages and most complex stretches of human development. . . . He is a Father, the Father of all men. (pp. 57, 58.)

And Swedenborg taught a great deal more about the meaning and use of the world than the author sets forth; and about the end of the world or death, too, he taught what this book sets forth as new, namely: —

> The relation of death to sin is not that of effect to cause, but of ethical association. . . . Because of sin death has acquired a significance which does not belong to it as a stage in the process of life. (p. 69.)

The chapter on Man opens as follows: —

> So far as experience shows, man is the outcome of the "cosmic process." . . . In him culminate the instinctive sensitivity, the imperfect strivings, of all lower orders of being, issuing in self-conscious rationality and will. (p. 71.)

Man is distinguished from the lower animals by the degree of his self-conscious life through which he is elevated to headship over the world, by the content of his social relations and by the emergence within him of the idea of God. While the animal has no permanent existence [because not self-conscious], man is interpreted not only as the crown of creation, but as member of a race which completes itself in the endless perfection of the individual, in the infinite richness of social relations and in fellowship with God. (pp. 71, 72.)

The bearing of this upon the origin of evil is important, for it is the animal in man that gravitates downward away from God and what is truly human is in the image and likeness of God. And here we find a remarkable approach to Swedenborg's doctrine of the correspondence of animals with man's affections, in the relation of cause and effect, and of the origin of evil animals and plants, for he writes: —

Man alone is fitted to discover the laws under which life perfects itself and thus the uses and relations wherein many of the higher species of plants and animals attain a fuller measure of self-realization. . . . Neither the world apart from man, nor man apart from the world, reaches the divine destination, but each is essential to the highest development of the other. If man turns his back on his upward course he drags some part of nature with him down to the point reached in his self-degradation. (p. 72.)

The discussion of evil and sin is full and discriminating. He shows the subtle fallacy of the doctrine of the "fall upward" as refuted by the sinlessness of the Lord Jesus; but, nevertheless, admits John Fiske's position in "Through Nature to God" (pp. 54, 55) that in the process of spiritual evolution evil needs to be present and also "evanescent." In other words, he finds temptation necessary to development and, therefore, the presence of evil, but not of sin or a fall. Thus Swedenborg requires a natural proprium, that which is born of the flesh, for the rebirth of the spirit. Turning to our author we read: —

In the realization of personality, the affirmation of the finite self as a reality over against the Infinite One is an inevitable moment. That such a self-affirmation may have place in an evil choice is not to be denied. The distinction of the individual from God must emerge clearly into consciousness before union of the soul with God can take place. One side is represented by the cry, "If it be possible, let this cup pass away from me!" The other side comes into prominence in the further cry, "Not what I will, but what Thou wilt!" In this antithesis which asserts itself in the human heart in relation to God lies the condition for the deepest agony, the fiercest struggle, the most splendid victory, and the highest human virtue. When, however, the affirmation of the individual self is persisted in after it is seen to be opposed to the ideal of human life in relation to God, then and then only it becomes sin. (pp. 97–99.)

In whatever form sin appears, therefore, it is an attempt to annul the ideal order in which man is placed and to substitute an irrational and impossible condition. This Dr. Beckwith presents clearly, but he does not answer the question, "Whether man, being what he is in innocence, on the one hand heavily weighted with animal appetites and also as we know with hereditary dispositions, and on the other hand with a principle of freedom to be developed in the use of fallible reason and an untrained will, could refrain from those acts in which sin appears?" And the question can be answered, we believe, only by a knowledge of what Swedenborg teaches of the storing of the remains of innocence and heavenly affections in infancy and childhood, by which man can be kept in freedom by the Lord and His angels. But the old doctrine of total depravity, in consequence of the fall, is promptly denied (p. 100). Nevertheless, evil and sin are seen to exist in an alienation from God; and the forgiveness of sins is found in a restoration to spiritual unity with Him. This is the meaning of the incarnation; Jesus Christ the Divine has come into perfect ethical and spiritual manifestation and the human has perfectly surrendered itself to the divine.

> Jesus Christ thus became a perfect organ for the self-revelation of God in and through a human life, and for the self-realization of man in union with God. (p. 168.)

The atonement, then, requires no change in God, but in man. Dr. Beckwith declares that there is no support in the New Testament nor in the nature of the case for the view that the death of Christ procured the forgiveness of sins. His redeeming activity must be sought not merely in His death, but also in His life (pp. 216, 217). "The ethical and spiritual world can never be the same again as it was before God was in Christ reconciling it to Himself" (p. 221). We have to regard His work "as that which actually breaks down the power of sin in man and draws him into filial relations with God" (p. 223). This is as near as the author comes to Swedenborg's great doctrine of redemption, by which the Lord is known to have met and conquered all the hells to preserve the freedom of men and angels and even of evil spirits also.

The second coming of the Lord is conceived of only as the gradual advance of redeemed society by the power of the Holy Spirit to a consummation (pp. 346–349). The doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh is rejected. We read: —

To us life is continuous and self-realization the goal towards which consciousness unceasingly strives. . . . By resurrection we mean the increasing realization of the Christian hope of life, especially after death, issuing in the perfection of all those who are the subjects of it. (p. 350.)

This view does not lead him to the doctrine of conditional immortality, but instead to the hope of a final restoration of all to union with God. But all this he leaves hidden "behind the veil." (p. 382.)

The consideration of the Trinity is left to the last chapter. The avoidance of the term "Person" in this connection is advocated because it is incorrect and misleading and some other expression as "hypostasis," "subsistence," "principle," or "potency" is suggested. The reality of Christian experience is then stated as follows: —

In an analysis of our conception of God we reach three ultimate and enduring principles — the principle of source, the principle of self-revelation, and the principle of self-communication. There are three; there can be but three; and all that we can conceive of the infinite mind may be reduced to these three: infinite life, light, love. Out of Him and through Him and unto Him are all things. (p. 397.)

This is, perhaps, as well as can be done with the old doctrine of the Trinity, for it is expressly declared that this is nothing new. It is certainly better than tri-personality. But we miss in it that which is new, namely, the clear and rational explanation of the glorified Divine-Human of our Lord Jesus Christ in which "dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily" — the one Person in whom is a Trinity of divine attributes — infinite love, infinite wisdom, and infinite power of service — in whom we see the Father and from whom we receive the Holy Spirit.

Nevertheless, the book is full of good strong thought; and the variety of presentations of truth in the natural plane concerning man's relations to God, the neighbor, and the natural universe, will richly reward every reader.

William Blake.*

Much has been written about William Blake. His life, his poetry, and his artistic works all have been fully published. The peculiar pages which he engraved on copper, both text and illustrations, will

*_William Blake._ By Arthur Symons. New York: E. P. Dutton & Company. 1907. 433 pp.

remain as curiosities of literature, and book-lovers will seek for them. He is a subject for study by the psychologist, but his opinions now go for nothing, and they have no significance to the New-Church mind, although many people think of Blake as a "Swedenborgian," and the volume before us constantly brings up Swedenborg in telling of Blake.

Mr. Symons, a poet and essayist, writes appreciatively of the author and engraver and has made perhaps the final book about him, adding to his own essay all the extracts from the writings of Henry Crabb Robinson, in which Blake appears, what is said in Malkin's Memoirs, Blake's Horoscope, some obituary notices, J. T. Smith's biographical sketch, and a chapter on Blake from Allan Cunningham. Printing extracts is not true literary work, but some of these are not easily accessible in their original form.

William Blake was born in London in humble circumstances in the memorable year 1757. He received little education, was apprenticed to an engraver, and followed his trade through life. He early married a lowly maid who accepted him almost at sight, and she was a most devoted and unselfish wife. He read nothing apparently but Bœhme, Law, and Swedenborg, but he objected to Swedenborg, though he once called him "the strongest of men," because "he was wrong in endeavoring to explain to the rational faculty what reason cannot comprehend." How unintelligible Swedenborg's clear statements were to him appears from what he wrote on the margin of "Angelic Wisdom"—"heaven and hell are born together."

Blake's mental peculiarity was his imagination to which every evening he gave free rein. He called it "the real and eternal world," and again, "Imagination is eternity." While he passed with many people for a lunatic and delighted in saying startling and paradoxical things, yet he was sane, though abnormal, and lived an outwardly blameless life. He claimed that his poetry, which was very defective in form, was dictated to him and written at times against his will. He loved Flaxman, the New-Church sculptor, deeply, but would not accept his advice. He would ramble on vehemently in company, asserting that "everything is holy," that he read the Bible with the devil in its infernal sense, that wives should be in common, that he would create a system and not be enslaved by another man's, that all are co-existent with God —"Jesus Christ is the only God, and so am I and so are you."

A genius of this kind makes a man unteachable and almost useless, so that Blake died in wretched poverty in 1827, and his wife took care of him to the last.

Of the poems the most approved is the short one beginning: —

Tiger, tiger, burning bright
In the forest of the night,
What immortal hand or eye
Framed thy fearful symmetry?

Others have preferred one on the lamb: —

Little lamb, who made thee?
Dost thou know who made thee?
Gave thee life, and bade thee feed,
By the stream, and o'er the mead;
Gave thee clothing of delight,
Softest clothing, woolly, bright;
Gave thee such a tender voice,
Making all the vales rejoice.
Little lamb, who made thee?
Dost thou know who made thee?

Little lamb, I'll tell thee;
Little lamb, I'll tell thee.
He is called by thy name,
For He calls Himself a Lamb.
He is meek and He is mild,
He became a little child;
I a child and thou a lamb,
We are called by His name.
Little lamb, God bless thee;
Little lamb, God bless thee.

It is very easy for practical people to misjudge a genius like Blake's, but it is impossible not to see in him, in the light of our teachings, a dangerous degree of control by enthusiastic spirits. He began by sitting before the fire when his day's work was done and seeing and drawing fantastic figures. This led on to broken nights when he felt impelled to spring up and write, so excited that his wife must rise also and sit by him. And so he came to speak of writing against his will, and the result was often wild and even wicked, as in his "Marriage of Heaven and Hell." Swedenborg tells in "The Divine Providence," 134, of "diabolical visions induced by means of enthusiastic spirits," and more fully he speaks in "Heaven and Hell," 249, of "visionaries and enthusiasts who believe whatever spirit

they hear to be the Holy Spirit, who see what is false as true; I have sometimes spoken with those spirits, and then the wickedness which they inspired in their worshippers was discovered." Probably it was because Blake felt himself so assailed that he leaned so much on Flaxman, who would have understood it well, and of Flaxman he wrote the strange lines: —

> My angels have told me that seeing such visions,
> I could not subsist on the earth,
> But by my conjunction with Flaxman,
> Who knows to forgive nervous fear.

Discoveries in Crete.*

The purpose of this book is to consider "the bearing of the discoveries in Crete on the history of ancient civilization." The author has been at great pains to go over all the recorded discoveries in Crete, to weigh what has been said by archæologists, and to draw conclusions which are meant to be safe. Of course it is still rather early to do this, for the excavations are by no means completed, but there is a pause in the work of Mr. Arthur Evans, who is said to lack funds, and in that of the British school, and Miss Harriet Boyd, after accomplishing wonders, has married. Mr. Richard B. Seager is at work for the university of Pennsylvania, but has not yet published his results.

The first effect of Mr. Evans's exploration of the palace of Minos and of alphabetic writing has scarcely passed away, and Crete stands in some minds as the very fountain-head of civilization; but Mr. Burrows is calm about these claims and means to check the enthusiasm which is apt to lead archæologists to think that all the ancient peoples must have borrowed all they had from some one. It is almost a novelty that Mr. Burrows contemplates parallel development, which is the much more reasonable hypothesis. He does, however, find the Trojan horse to have been Assyrian, hence the strange words: —

> The idea of the wooden horse in which the Greeks entered Troy is seen to have been taken from the tall siege engines of the Assyrians, in which the top

*_The Discoveries in Crete._ By Ronald M. Burrows. New York: E. P. Dutton & Company. 1907. Illustrated. 244 pp.

platform swung round on a revolving pivot like an animal's head and neck above the level of the walls. Hence the "leaping" of the wall, and the setting down of the "armed brood" within the city.

As to chronology it is pointed out that, while early Cretan civilization may be said to be of the Bronze Age and its later period of the Iron Age, Mr. Evans can now divide his objects into some nine periods. The word "Mycenæan" is losing definiteness. At the same time Crete retains the distinction of having nothing of later times superimposed on its ruins. They are older than Phœnician cities, or than those of classical Greece.

Of the writing Mr. Evans will soon publish the results of his studies, though they will be partial and tentative. He makes out a few points, but not the meaning. A bilingual inscription having also Greek or Egyptian is necessary, but has not been found and is hardly to be expected.

A ludicrous result of this study of Crete is that there proves to be a seeming discrepancy in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as to certain rulers; at least so it looks now; and the higher critic never waits for further light, but puts the text right in his eyes at whatever cost. The passage is, therefore, expunged, later another line must come out. This is done by one, another rewrites the passage, another changes one word, and Mr. Burrows remarks that "all this athetizing [rejecting as spurious] and emendation is unsound."

Materials of Religious Education.*

In reading this volume one is impressed with the zeal of busy men who travelled long distances in order to read and hear fifty papers on themes of great importance. "Annual Survey of Progress," "What is a Christian Nation?" "Quickening the Public Conscience," "Deficient Supply of Men for the Ministry," "Need of Theological Education," "Organized Sunday-School Instruction," "Ideals of Moral Education," "Ethical Value of Physical Training," "Character Making of Boys"— these are some of the subjects treated. The speakers evidently felt perfect liberty and evidently spoke as concisely as possible. The Convention quickened the life of the organization, and we hope that the necessary expenses of its activities can be met so that it may be set free from pecuniary anxiety.

*Papers and Proceedings of the Fourth Convention of the Religious Education Association, Rochester, N. Y., Feb. 5–7, 1907. Printed by the Association at 153 La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. 379 pp.

Arthur Hamilton.*

This remarkable book appeared anonymously in 1886, and was believed to be an actual biography. It is now reprinted, and, whatever its source, is most instructive. An English lad of good parentage goes through college without distinction, becomes a thoughtful wanderer, and finally settles in Cornwall with the care of a lad from Persia whom he prepares for Cambridge and who dies early, leaving the older man to look forward to going to be with him in resurrection.

Some of Hamilton's words are significant, as when, in despair of the church, he says:—

> I believe in a revelation which is coming, which may be among us now, though we do not suspect it, in the words and deeds of some simple-minded, heroic man. This revelation will be as unexpected as it will be new — it will come as a thief in the night. It will take the form of some vast simplification of the myriad and complicated issues of human life.

He did not find such a revelation, but he certainly had the right thought, and we should say that, in coming to see the spiritual in its relation to the natural, he would have gained much light upon his problems.

At another time he wrote of what was really a spiritual temptation:

> A blank misgiving without any adequate cause is upon me to-day. One cannot help feeling during such times that some mysterious warfare may be being fought out somewhere over one's only half-conscious soul; that some strange decision may be pending.

He was once called to the bedside of a very sick farmer, to whom the rector had said, "You must prepare to meet your God. Are you at peace with Him? Remember the judgment." The farmer said to Hamilton that it was hard to go out into the dark, but the answer was:—

> It will make it easier for you if you fix your thoughts on one thing. Think that there is a loving hand waiting to take yours, that One who loves you is waiting on the other side of the darkness. He hears the words you speak to Him. He is here now. Let me say a prayer with you.

Is not that the wisdom which the clergyman wholly lacked? A poor woman on whom he called said of his visit:—

**Memoirs of Arthur Hamilton.* By Arthur C. Benson. New York: Mitchell Kennerley. 1907. 186 pp.

I can't tell how it was, he spoke very little of Him, but he seemed to remind me of the Lord Jesus more than all the sermons. He was so kind and gentle, he seemed to bring God with him.

When spiritism came to his notice, a brief investigation was sufficient, and he said, "It is nothing but a fashionable drawing-room game." When Hamilton's end drew near, he asked for the sacrament, but the clergyman refused, because he had not attended the Communion for years. Yet at last the clergyman came, but too late to do more than begin a prayer.

The power in this book seems to us to lie in the fact that it is in no way a mere arraignment of a cold, formal, and unfruitful church, but is a quiet search for essential Christianity, the highest service of humanity. There are not a few like Hamilton, the saving remnant, and their numbers slowly increase. It is to such that the faith of the New Church in the risen Lord as the God of love and truth and universal care, satisfies the hunger of the soul, which seeks to find its Master and to do from Him the wise and good deeds of daily life.

Woman's Wisdom.*

This book has nine homely interviews with a good old matron of Kentucky, telling with innocent fun and not a little pathos about the new organ and the church carpet and the immersion and the tournament and the like, ending with the best sketch — Aunt Jane in her garden where every plant was dear to her and many of them spoke of tender memories. It is at the close of that interview that she says: —

I know I've got to leave this country some day soon and journey to another one and the only thing I mind about it is givin' up my gyarden. When John looked into heaven he saw gold streets and gates of pearl, but he don't say anything about gyardens. I like what he says about no sorrer, nor cryin', nor pain, and God wipin' away all tears from their eyes. That's pure comfort. But if I could jest have Abram and the children again and my old home and my old gyarden, I'd be willing to give up the gold streets and glass sea and pearl gates.

This expresses the true heart's demand for a home in heaven, for companionship renewed with those gone before, and for all the innocent delights of this life; and these are precisely what the risen soul will have — a real world in which all will correspond with the

**Aunt Jane of Kentucky.* By Eliza Calvert Hall. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1907. 283 pp. $1.50.

inward and abiding affections of those who dwell in its various regions. Not only will one like this good woman have what her soul desires, but more and better than her experience in this world would enable her to name. Nor is the garden missing from the Apocalypse, for it speaks of the crystal streams and the trees of life bearing all manner of fruit. These symbols assure us of all other beautiful and uplifting aspects of spiritual life begun here and continued hereafter as "eye hath not seen nor ear heard."

The Ministry as a Profession.*

Three addresses, given at the Harvard Divinity School, by the President of the University, the Bishop of Massachusetts, and Dr. George A. Gordon, of Boston, have been issued by the school as a Prospectus. Dr. Gordon spoke first on, "The Claims of the Ministry upon Strong Men." Others he would not advise to enter the ministry, but persons of "intellectual power and high moral ideals" should enter it because it deals with religion, "a fundamental human interest," because they will work in good company, and because they will have satisfaction in it of a noble kind and of increasing fulness.

Bishop Lawrence gave an informal talk about the possibilities of service to a man who is generous enough to work for some community in the love of helping all its inhabitants, and he compared such a life with that of a man in business to the disadvantage of the latter, because the minister has to do with vital relations. He need not wait to become clear in theology, said the Bishop, for his main work is "putting his own spiritual personality into each individual, purifying society from beneath."

President Eliot, always concise, said that Harvard men desire three things — to be serviceable, to be free, to grow in efficiency and influence. Now the ministry gives them an opportunity to live this life. It has not always left them free, but it is coming to that. "To become a serviceable, free, growing minister is a worthy ambition for any intelligent and high-minded young man."

To all which we should add that the minister must have a clear, strong, eternal message for mankind.

*Divinity School of Harvard University. 1907. 31 pp.

Luke the Physician.*

In the present unsettled condition of opinion concerning the Bible, occasioned by the work of the higher criticism, the Christian world hails with joy this book by so great and authoritative a scholar as Professor Harnack, because it confirms the authorship of the portions of the Scriptures so long attributed to Luke the physician. Ten years ago he stated "that the criticism of the *sources* of primitive Christianity was gradually returning to the traditional standpoints." Now in the first to be published of his series of New Testament studies, he ably illustrates his meaning. He does not mean that the scholars of the church are returning to the old orthodox view of the Scriptures and their canon, for he holds "that many traditional positions are untenable and must give place to new and startling discoveries." But the home and formation of the most primitive and fundamental Christian tradition, he asserts, can be circumscribed to the period from 30 to 70 A.D., and on the soil of Palestine. This is according to the traditions of the church and contrary to the "hypothesis of the higher critics," which assumed that it extended over the period of a century, and that the whole Diaspora took part in its formation.

The so-called "We" account of the Acts of the Apostles is first investigated, with the conclusion that Luke was the companion of Paul, and wrote as a participator in the events described. He does not hesitate to consider every objection of the "critics" in reaching this result. The proof of the authorship of the third Gospel he considers an easier matter, holding that if the second Gospel is attributed to Mark there is no difficulty in attributing the third to Luke, for his chief authority for it was the work of Mark, his late companion in Rome. Other sources of information are pointed out, and especially Philip and his four prophesying daughters. Dr. Harnack regards them and other similar sources as "ecstatics" altogether wanting in credibility.

**New Testament Studies:* 1. Luke the Physician, the author of the Third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles. By Adolf Harnack, Professor of Church History in the University of Berlin. Translated by the Rev. J. R. Wilkinson, M.A., and edited by the Rev. W. D. Morrison, LL.D. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons; London: Williams and Norgate. 1907. 12mo. cloth. $1.50.

This is to be regretted by a New-Churchman, because it discredits much of the supernatural and is usually employed against the accounts of the Virgin Birth of our Lord and the miracles as signs of His divine power. But it can hardly be otheriwse until the true doctrine of the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures is understood. As long as the same historical tests and literary methods of criticism are applied to the Word of God as to any ancient but merely human writings, scholars cannot see how the Divine Providence has employed human hands to write divine revelation and selected the very words that shall be used as well as the events to be narrated.

But under this kind of scholarship much of value and interest is shown, for instance that a considerable portion of Luke's Gospel deals with women and is of feminine interest; that three-fourths of the Gospel of Mark appears in it, but clothed in different language. The aspects of it which are not good are seen in the way in which miracles are accounted for. We read: —

> All four evangelists record the cutting off of the ear [of the servant of the High Priest], but St. Luke alone allows it to be healed again by our Lord; thus he alone was scandalized by the fact that the poor fellow had lost his ear. As he before defended the credit of the medical profession in general, so now he stands forth in championship of our Lord the Physician. It would have been inexcusable if He had not exerted His miraculous powers of healing on this occasion.

A foot-note is added as follows: —

> This is a flagrant instance of the way in which a story of a miracle has arisen, of what we may expect from St. Luke. He certainly is not following a separate source here; but because he thinks it ought to have been so, he makes it happen so. (p. 187.)

Is not this a flagrant example rather of the way in which the higher criticism assumes what it pleases concerning the origin and formation of the letter of the Word of God, instead of reverently recognizing the Divine Providence over the selection and arrangement of the material? Why should not the Lord guide the mind of Luke to such information, and such use of it, as He saw fit in the compilation of His own revelation of Himself?

In this way the account of the Virgin Birth of Jesus is disposed of by Dr. Harnack and some other higher critics (p. 167 and note 1). And while it is no longer possible to rule out the entire chapters in which the account of it is found in Matthew's and Luke's Gospels,

the verses which tell of the conception by the Holy Spirit (34, 35) are discarded as not written by Luke himself, but interpolated afterwards by those who thought it necessary to so account for that miraculous life.

Nevertheless, Dr. Harnack holds that the first two chapters of the third Gospel were written by Luke and shows certain indications that *The Magnificat* and *The Benedictus* are works of his own genius. (p. 215 and note 1.)

We close with a significant and beautiful tribute to Luke the physician: —

> What a wealth of matter of all kinds is found in peaceful juxtaposition in these two books! [the Gospel and the Acts.] The subject-matter, indeed, is even more varied than the forms of expression! From this significant fact we may estimate and realize what a multitude of various conceptions could be accepted and reconciled with one another *in one and the same* mind. St. Luke writes absolutely without bias; or, rather, he is biased in *one* direction only — his one object is to prove that our Lord is the divine Saviour and to show forth His saving power in His history and in the working of His spirit. (p. 165.)

STANDARD NEW-CHURCH BOOKS.

The Life and Mission of Emanuel Swedenborg. With Portrait. Benjamin Worcester	$2.00
Swedenborg and the New Church. James Reed	50 cents
Lectures on the New Dispensation. Benjamin F. Barrett	60 cents
The Divine Word Opened. Jonathan Bayley	1.00
Emanuel Swedenborg; his Life, Teachings, and Influence. George Trobridge. Paper	25 cents
Discrete Degrees in Successive and Simultaneous Order. Nathan C. Burnham. Illustrated by Diagrams.	4.00
Dictionary of Correspondences	1.25
General Index to Swedenborg's Scripture Quotations. Arthur Hodson Searle	3.00
The Nature of Spirit and of Man as a Spiritual Being. Chauncey Giles	50 cents
Foundation Truths of the Christian Religion; passages selected from Swedenborg	50 cents
The Science of Correspondences Elucidated. Edward Madeley	1.50
Swedenborg's Doctrine of Correspondence. Lewis P. Mercer	75 cents
An Appeal in Behalf of the Views Held by the New Church. Samuel Noble	75 cents
Outlines of the Religion and Philosophy of Swedenborg. Theophilus Parsons	50 cents
The Professor's Letters; with Portrait of the Author. Theophilus Parsons	60 cents
Paper boards	30 cents
The Holy Word in its own Defence. Abiel Silver	75 cents
The Swedenborg Concordance. 6 vols. Cloth	24.00
Swedenborg and the Doctrines of the New Church. Rudolph L. Tafel	1.75
Bibliography of the Works of Emanuel Swedenborg; original and translated. Rev. James Hyde	10.00
Compendium of the Theological Writings of Swedenborg. Samuel M. Warren	1.50
Correspondences of the Bible: Animals. John Worcester	1.00
" " " **Plants, etc.** " "	1.00
Physiological Correspondences. John Worcester	1.00
Spiritual Interpretation of the Scriptures. John Worcester	
Genesis and Exodus.	75 cents
Matthew's Gospel.	50 cents

MASSACHUSETTS NEW-CHURCH UNION

No. 16 ARLINGTON STREET, BOSTON

Works of Emanuel Swedenborg.

ROTCH EDITION. 12mo.

The Heavenly Arcana disclosed which are in the Sacred Scripture or Word of the Lord. Vols. I. to XIX., text; Vol. XX., index. Each $1.25

Heaven and Its Wonders, and Hell $1.25

The White Horse. Paper . . . . . 15 cents

The New Jerusalem and Its Heavenly Doctrine as learned from Heaven . . . . . 75 cents

The Earths in our Solar System, which are called Planets, and the Earths in the Starry Heavens; their Inhabitants, and Spirits and Angels thence. Paper . . . . . 30 cents

The Final Judgment and the Destruction of Babylon; also **Continuation** concerning the Final Judgment and concerning the Spiritual World. Paper . . . . . 35 cents

The Intercourse between the Soul and the Body. Paper 15 cents

Four Doctrines of the New Jerusalem. Concerning the Lord; the Sacred Scripture; a Life According to the Precepts of the Decalogue; and Faith $1.00

Angelic Wisdom Concerning the Divine Love and the Divine Wisdom: also the **Intercourse** between the Soul and the Body $1.00

Angelic Wisdom Concerning the Divine Providence . $1.25

The Apocalypse Revealed. 3 Vols. $3.75

Marriage Love $1.25

A Summary Exposition of the Doctrine of the New Church. Paper . . . . . 25 cents

The True Christian Religion. 3 Vols. $3.75

Miscellaneous Theological Works [consisting of **The Final Judgment, The White Horse, The Earths in Our Solar System,** and the **Summary Exposition of the Doctrine of the New Church**] $1.25

The Rotch Edition is now complete as regards the theological writings published by Swedenborg himself.

Our Catalog, listing other editions of Swedenborg's writings as well as works by collateral writers, will be sent on application.

MASSACHUSETTS NEW-CHURCH UNION

16 ARLINGTON STREET, BOSTON